NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DI.

AUGUST, 1898.

WHAT THE UNIONISTS HAVE DONE FOR IRELAND.

BY T. W. RUSSELL, M. P., SECRETARY OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

WITH the passage of the Irish Local Government Bill things have now reached a point at which it is possible to take stock of the policy of the Unionist Party in Ireland—when it is even desirable to cast up the accounts and to ascertain what the position really is. At the election of 1886 the policy of setting up an Irish Parliament was negatived in the most decided manner by the constituencies. In 1895 the condemnation of that policy was even more emphatic. But neither of these verdicts was given on the assumption that everything was right, or as it ought to be, in Ireland. They were delivered, on the contrary, after the fullest admission by the Unionis leaders that there were grievances to be redressed and wrongs to be righted, and it was clearly affirmed that the Imperial Parliament was at once able and willing to do what was right by Ireland and her people. Lord Hartington, all through the dogged and splendid resistance he offered to Mr. Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill, took this ground. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain were equally emphatic. And now that three years of strong Unionist administration have come and gone since

Copyright, 1898, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1895, it is alike interesting and desirable to ask where we stand—what has been done and what remains to be accomplished? The Irish question, apart, of course, from the demand for the restoration of national rights, may be thus summarized: (1.) Land reform; (2.) Local government; (3.) The Western problem; (4.) Higher education.

I propose to deal with each of these subjects. My contention is that, with one exception, they have been recognized by the Unionist Party to require, not only attention, but radical treatment, and that before the present Parliament expires they are, with the exception referred to, almost certain to be dealt with and satisfactorily settled. I go further and venture to maintain that, when these great issues are satisfactorily settled, no sectional grievance of any importance will remain. Social legislation will, of course, be demanded. Administrative reform will be necessary. As the country progresses new problems will necessarily spring up. But these problems will affect the whole people, and will not demand exceptional or sectional treatment. It is, therefore, of supreme importance that, in order to reach this point, what remains of British prejudice in regard to Ireland should be overcome. The Irish Representatives no longer hold the balance of power in the House of Commons. They are hopelessly divided among themselves. They appear to hate each other far more than they hate "the common enemy." And it is perfectly true that with the revised procedure of Parliament they can be defied. I believe, however, that the Government and the House of Commons ought to resist this great temptation; that, while setting their foot firmly down on the policy of dismemberment, they ought with patience, and even with some sacrifice, to endeavor to undo the wrongs of the past, and so put themselves right in the eyes of the civilized world. Let us see how far this Unionist policy has been carried out. I begin with the

QUESTION OF THE LAND.

Where do we stand on this crucial question? It is impossible to deny that during the last year or two a certain sympathy has begun to grow up in favor of the Irish landlords. Agricultural depression has resulted in the serious cutting down of rents, and it is to be feared that this process has meant the ruin of many a man upon whom the extravagance and sins of his fathers have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been visited. This may or may not be an ignorant sympathy, because, in the first place, the fall in the price of agricultural produce has everywhere necessitated a serious reduction in rent; and, secondly, because the outcry against the Land Commission as a partial tribunal, which brought Sir Edward Fry and his colleagues on to the stage, has been finally disproved by the authority of the Fry commission itself. But the sympathy has undoubtedly arisen. It was inevitable that in such a work as fixing the rents of the farmers of Ireland there should be many mistakes, and that circumstances should even at times have involved carelessness and hurry. But on the question of the impartiality of the tribunal, Sir Edward Fry's words are conclusive:

> **"We are convinced, as we have already shown, that the settlement of fair rents has been effected in an unsatisfactory manner—with diversity of opinion and practice—sometimes with carelessness, and sometimes with that bias toward one side or the other which exists in many honest minds; but we are also convinced that the administration of justice has not been poisoned by any systematic endeavors on the part of the Commissioners or of the Assistant Commissioners to benefit either side at the expense of the other."**

Not in the least surprised, therefore, at the outcry of the Landowners' Convention, and not believing that rents have been unduly reduced, I come to look at the question from the standpoint of the tenant. Has justice at last been done? If not, what remains to be accomplished?

When I was a boy the Irish tenant was in the main a mere serf. Denied all political rights, he had no legal right to his own property in the soil. If he built his own home—which was usually the case—it belonged to the landlord. If he reclaimed, drained or fenced his land, it was mainly done on the security of a yearly tenancy, and he was liable to eviction, and he was often evicted without a farthing of compensation. Hence the shape of the demand in the forties and fifties by the League of North and South. Men like Sharman Crawford, Gavan Duffy and Dr. McKnight combined for one purpose. They asked for security of tenure and legal protection for the property of the tenant. Truly, a moderate and a modest demand. But what fate awaited it? Sir Joseph Napier, the representative of Trinity College, and the Irish Attorney-General in Lord Derby's Administration, introduced a bill in 1854 which met the demand fairly, and might have settled the question for a generation. But the Irish land-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lords would have none of it. The bill perished. Reasonable reform was refused. The lapse of half a century has brought loss and trouble, ending with revolution. The revolution commenced with Mr. Gladstone's bill of 1870. It was practically completed by the Acts of 1881 and 1887. These great measures suffered severely in the Irish courts. But the Morley Committee of 1894, shedding the clear light of day upon the actual facts, paved the way for and rendered absolutely necessary the Act of 1896, by which many of the decisions of the Irish Court of Appeal, however right they may have been in strict law, were reversed as being against public policy and the intention of Parliament, with the result that the tenant's advocate no longer feels when he enters the court that he is treading on a series of trapdoors.

Under the various enactments passed since 1870, the Irish tenant has now secured, among many other things:

(1.) Absolute security of tenure on payment of a fair rent.

(2.) A fair rent, fixed by a tribunal set up by Parliament.

(3.) The right to sell his interest in the tenancy to the highest bidder.

(4.) Absolute protection for his improvements, and the presumption, with certain limitations, as to ownership in his favor.

(5.) Facilities for purchase where the owner agrees to sell, the whole purchase money being advanced by the state.

(6.) Compulsory sale of bankrupt estates in the Land Judges' Courts to the tenants.

The bare enumeration of these rights must convince every fair-minded man that Parliament has gone a very long way toward making an end of the Irish land question. I quite admit that there are points left unsettled, and that the question of the administration of the acts by the Land Commission is of enormous importance. But no one can now say, assuming that things remain as they are, that the Land Law as it affects agricultural tenancies is unjust. It may doubtless permit of individual cases of hardship. The depression in agriculture may make it hard for the farmers to live. But the law is now substantially just in theory, and, notwithstanding mistakes, is on the whole reasonably administered.

One matter, however, of great importance stands out, requiring attention and careful handling. By the Act of 1896 it was proposed to clear the Land Judges' Court of all those bankrupt es-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tates for which a receiver had been appointed by the court. There are hundreds of such properties in the court. Grave difficulties have, however, arisen in the administration of the 40th section of this act. Under this section the Land Judge claims that he alone has the right to decide the price at which the estate may be sold, and that the duty of the Land Commission is confined to valuing the land for the purposes of sale. The contention of the Land Commission is that the Land Purchase Acts apply to estates in the Land Judges' Court, in the same way as they apply to the estates of ordinary vendors.

In this way a complete deadlock has been brought about. Mr. Justice Ross is supposed to take a somewhat liberal view in dealing with the money of the British taxpayer, and in fixing the price to be paid for these bankrupt estates. The Land Commission, on the other hand, is suspected of somewhat narrow dealing—suspected, that is to say, of overlooking the fact that the state in advancing the money has the interest of both landlord and tenant as security for the advance. It is to be hoped, now that the Court of Appeal has decided against the contention of the Land Judge, now that it has been decided that Mr. Justice Ross has no power under the act to "ladle out the money" of the British taxpayer to the mortgagees of bankrupt Irish landowners, a way out of the serious difficulty may be found.

This, however, is administration. The intention of Parliament is clear. What the Act of 1896 intended to do was to clear the Land Judges' Court of these estates, to abolish a huge Rent Office managed by the state, and to give to the tenants on these estates the option of purchase.

To my mind, then, on the land question the Imperial Parliament has gone as far in principle as an Irish Parliament could or ought to go. And the Land Law, so far as agricultural tenancies are concerned, being now substantially just, all that Parliament can do is to see that the Purchase Acts have a free course, and that the Law of Tenure is administered without fear, favor or affection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

It is now almost sixty years since Lord John Russell promised to substitute County Boards for Grand Juries, in answer to the demand of O'Connell. Sixty years is no doubt a long time to wait. But it has not all been loss. I doubt whether the Irish people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sixty years ago were ready for local self government. Indeed, I am sure they were not. And in connection with this point it ought to be remembered that England, Wales and Scotland only received this right in 1888 and 1889. But, be this as it may, the revolution has come, and come with a vengeance. Mr. Gerald Balfour's bill is thorough, whatever else it may be. Let us roughly set out what it proposes to do.

(1.) It arranges for the transfer of all the administrative functions of the Grand Juries to County Councils elected on a popular franchise, *i. e.*, the parliamentary, *plus* peers and women.

(2.) It changes the entire incidence of rating, making the occupier everywhere liable for a consolidated rate.

(3.) It provides for the payment out of Imperial funds of half of the County Cess now paid wholly by the occupier, and the half of the Poor Rate now paid by the owner. This involves a contribution from Imperial sources of something like £730,000 *per annum*.

(4.) It vests the management and control of lunatic asylums in a Visiting Committee, to be chosen by the County Council.

(5.) It provides for the establishment of Rural District Councils, the members of which will be the Sanitary Authority, and will be elected on the same franchise as the County Councillors.

(6.) It confines the Poor Law authorities, *i. e.*, the Boards of Guardians, to poor law work, and transfers everything foreign to that work to either the County or the Rural District Council.

(7.) It abolishes *ex-officio* Guardians, the property qualification for election and plural voting, and substitutes vote by ballot for the present plan of voting by papers.

(8.) It assimilates the franchise in boroughs and small towns to that in force in the country.

These are some of the leading provisions in what has been justly called "this revolutionary measure." For it is a revolution. If I were to assume that things in Ireland were to continue as they are now, that the battle for place on these Councils was to be fought on party or religious grounds, the bill would mean the transfer of every atom of power to the Nationalists and Catholics in 27 out of the 32 Irish Counties. As to the remaining four Counties, it would mean that in Antrim, Down and Derry the Presbyterians would settle accounts with the Episcopalians, and that the latter body would hold Armagh

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I look forward to nothing of the kind—for these, among other reasons. Many highly intelligent Nationalists are seriously exercised in their minds as to the working out of this great scheme. In most of the Counties the people are wholly unaccustomed to work of this kind. The educated men of many districts, apart from the country gentry, consist of the priests and the shopkeepers, and the former class are wholly excluded from election by the bill. For a Home Rule Parliament each County could easily have found four capable men, either inside or outside its bounds, as representatives. To find 30 or 40 County Councillors who must be residents is a wholly different matter. And the Nationalists I refer to, view with some apprehension such an experiment as Mr. Gerald Balfour proposes. For, of course, a breakdown in County Government would be very injurious, if not absolutely fatal, to the National demand. The Unionists would say at once: "If you cannot manage the affairs of a County or a District, how are you to manage those of a Nation?" This very difficulty, and the necessity for ensuring that no breakdown shall take place, will necessitate the election of a certain number of those Unionists who, on the Grand Juries and other public boards, have been accustomed to do the public work of the County or District. This necessity for co-operation will therefore tend to break down the strong party feeling which now exists. And I look upon it as certain that a considerable number of those Unionist country gentlemen who have been accustomed to County work will find seats on the new boards.

But there is another and a better ground upon which I reach the same conclusion. I refer to the sensible decay of party feeling in Ireland. There are many Protestants who have strenuously resisted the demand for an Irish Parliament, who, admitting the strength of the Nationalist case from certain standpoints, desire to co-operate heartily with the majority of the people, where co-operation is possible. They do not think that the government of Ireland by England has always been wise. Indeed, up to 1868 it abounded in mistakes sufficient to madden a sensitive people. Short of a separate Legislature, they desire to pay respectful attention to every reasonable demand made on behalf of the majority of the Irish people. I know this to be a growing feeling among educated Protestants. This bill, and this is one of its chief attractions for me, will enormously foster this feeling. It is only a few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months since Roman Catholics gained admission to the corporations of Belfast and Londonderry. They were, of course, excluded not on account of their religion, but by the franchise which prevailed in the one case, and by the arrangement of the wards in the other. What has been the result? Extreme men on the Protestant side fretted and fumed. Deputations tried to persuade Members of Parliament of the mischief that would be certain to ensue. Is the business of these Irish towns anything the worse for the admixture of a handful of "mere papists" in the Town Councils? No one—not the extremest of Orangemen—will say so. A great blot on the administration of these towns has been removed, and the air is all the sweeter for the removal of this grievance.

Look at the House of Commons itself. Ten years ago no man knew what a sitting would bring forth. The Irish Nationalist members were at war with the House. Years before I entered Parliament I had been on terms of friendship with such men as Mr. Healy, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Jordan. But the stress and strain of this acute daily warfare severed all friendships and made us almost personal foes. We agreed on many things, and we knew that we agreed. But such was the bitterness of the strife that all agreement was lost sight of in the daily feud that raged. This feeling has, I rejoice to think, passed away. I can now meet and consult with Irish Nationalists on Irish questions. At a critical moment in the history of the Morley Land Committee in 1894, when the Unionists left the room and washed their hands of the whole business, I was able to remain in my seat and co-operate heartily with Mr. Dillon, Mr. Healy and Mr. Sexton in drawing a report which necessitated the Act of 1896, and I can with confidence assert that no act of mine in Parliament has more entirely commended itself to the people I represent than this one, which would have been impossible ten years ago. Colonel Saunderson can now preside over a meeting of Irish Members, representing every party, to discuss the financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland. And, speaking generally, a truce has been called.

This blessed spirit has been apparent all through the discussions on the Local Government Bill. From the first there has been a section of Irish Unionists who disliked the bill. These gentlemen did not take the ground that out and out resistance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ought to be offered to it. No such line of battle was possible. It was felt to be absurd that powers and privileges conferred ten years ago upon the laborers of Dorset and Devon should be withheld from the Irish farmer. But the demand for "safeguards," for a minority vote, for the disfranchisement of illitterates, for double member constituencies, and for other restrictions calculated to lessen the voting power of the majority of the Irish people, was persistent. It is greatly to the credit of Colonel Saunderson, Colonel Waring and Mr. Wm. Johnston—all three typical Orangemen—that they have stood firmly by the bill and have not sought to embarrass the Government. These gentlemen have followed this course, although denounced by their organs in the press and on platforms. And it is only just and fair to recognize the fact. What the outcome of it all may be is another matter. It is a great experiment. It is not too much to say that its success will depend wholly upon the spirit shown by the Irish leaders on both sides. If religion and politics do not get the upper hand in the elections, if the best and most competent men are chosen as Councillors, if there is a general determination to let the dead past bury its dead and to work in the future for the good of the country, then Mr. Gerald Balfour's bill will bring with it a healing power for which all men will be found to speak him well. But whatever comes, this fact cannot be questioned—the Irish people will have got the complete management of their local affairs. In this respect they will be in exactly the same position of England, Scotland and Wales.

HIGHER EDUCATION.

Upon this question much might have been said twelve months ago. Little I fear can, or need, be said to-day. Five and twenty years ago Mr. Gladstone made a courageous effort to deal with this question—the most difficult and thorny question in Irish politics. The great man failed in his effort—failed because of the opposition of Trinity College, Dublin, and of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops. During the present year Mr. Arthur Balfour, the ablest and the most popular leader the Conservative party has seen for many years, has approached the question afresh from another standpoint. I am afraid it must be said that he, too, has failed, although he has had the support of Trinity College and the good will of the Roman Catholic representatives in Parlia-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. After a two days' debate in the House of Commons, in which the whole weight of the House, as well as of the argument, was in favor of the views expressed by the First Lord of the Treasury, it was felt that the question could not be taken up by the Government without the certainty of dividing the Unionist party in a way that the Government could not risk. Mr. Balfour did not contemplate, as is generally supposed, the establishment and endowment of a Roman Catholic university, pure and simple. What he did contemplate was the establishment and endowment of a second University in Ireland on lines acceptable to Roman Catholics, *i. e.*, a university whose doors, offices and emoluments would be open to all creeds, as in the case of the University of Dublin, but the board or governing body of which should be Roman Catholic, just as the Senate of the University of Dublin is Protestant. Whatever grievance the Roman Catholics of Ireland may have in connection with this matter, and personally I think it a very real and serious grievance, there is not the slightest use in attempting to conceal the fact that the "No Popery" feeling in certain parts of England and Scotland, the strong Nonconformist view against even the indirect endowment of religion by the state, added to the opposition of Ulster, all combine to make the task almost an impossibility. I regret it on every ground. In the first place it makes a good Home Rule argument. I cannot say in the future what I have always maintained in the past—that the Imperial Parliament is alike able and willing to remedy every Irish grievance. I admit the grievance here. And I have, also, to admit that Anti-Roman prejudice is still strong enough to prevent the application of a remedy. I regret it, also, because of the injury accruing to Ireland by the refusal. It is all very well to say that Ireland is a country of small farmers and that it is the means of earning their daily bread, not university education, that is wanted. But what would Scotland have been if this argument had prevailed? It is the glory of that part of the United Kingdom that the sons of the common people have gone from the parish school to Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen or St. Andrews, and that as a result they have conferred honor and renown on the land of their birth in every part of the world. The way ought to be open in Ireland as it has been and is now in Scotland. It is not technically barred at present so far as the state is concerned. Trinity College, the Queen's Colleges and the Royal University

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are open to all creeds. This is quite true. But as regards Trinity and the Queen's, both institutions are banned by the Church, while the Royal is a mere examining body, and not much of that. A Roman Catholic lad whose parents desire that he should receive the advantages of university education ought not to be compelled to get it at the expense of his conscientious convictions. He ought not to be forced to transgress the law and disobey the mandate of his Church. At all events, the question, I fear, is settled for the present Parliament, and settled in a way that is certain to produce mischief and trouble in the future.

THE WESTERN PROBLEM.

I have now given a brief sketch of the present situation as regards three questions of first-class importance—the Land, Local Government and Higher Education. I come now to consider another problem occupying public attention, upon which some action is clearly desirable—the condition of large numbers of people in certain parts of the South and West, commonly described as the congested districts. Special attention has been lately concentrated upon these areas by the failure of the potato crop and the consequent want and distress which invariably follow in the train of this calamity. Here, the question of the extent of this distress, and the best methods of dealing with it, does not arise. I wish to get behind the distress itself to the causes which produce it, and to the remedies which are capable of being applied.

Visiting these districts, and witnessing the extreme poverty of the people, one cannot help asking what the conditions of life must have been prior to 1847, when the population was double what it is to-day. But even with the clearances that have taken place since that dread period, the evidences of which are visible to the naked eye to-day, the cry of want and distress comes to the doors of Parliament with unfailing regularity. Given the slightest failure in the potato crop, the resources of the Poor Law are immediately strained, relief works in some shape or other are called for, demoralization at once sets in, and the whole country is humiliated. Why should such a state of affairs exist? These districts form part of a country rich beyond the dreams of avarice. The annual budget of the United Kingdom amounts to £112,000,000, sterling. The country is full of realized wealth. Its industrial progress is one of the wonders of the world. It can spend £130,-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000,000 *per annum* on alcoholic luxuries without apparent suffering. Why, then, should a state of affairs such as exists within this limited and well-defined area be allowed to go on—getting worse, as some people think, rather than better, as the years go round?

The first thing necessary here is to get at the facts. Roughly speaking, the area to be dealt with lies on the western seaboard of Ireland, and includes certain portions of Kerry, Mayo, Galway and Donegal. The actual facts of the problem are simple in the extreme. In these parts of Ireland agriculture, or what goes by that name, is the sole industry. As a result of the famine of 1847, cattle and sheep have taken to a very large extent the place of human beings. Great tracts of country have been turned into sheep walks. The best of the land has been given over to grazing and the people are left to scratch the mountain side or to reclaim patches from among the rocks. Life is impossible for people under such circumstances. The young men go to England and Scotland for the harvest—where their labor is greatly appreciated. Young girls go to domestic service. Others go to America. And from all three sources a revenue is obtained which in normal times just suffices to keep body and soul together. From the land itself subsistence for a family is impossible. The people grow potatoes, with the result that, using the same seed year by year, the land gets worn out. Then come failure and relief works. They rear small cattle on the bleak mountain sides—animals that are hardly worth rearing and which produce little or nothing when they are reared. Out of much of such land no economic rent is possible, and no landlord can have any real interest in anything there save in a radical reform of the whole plan of living. In normal times the diet of thousands of these people is more meagre than that of the ordinary pauper in the worst of our English workhouses. I saw recently that an accomplished correspondent of a smart daily paper confessed his inability to find "the famine" that was being insisted on by the Irish members in Parliament. But this same gentleman admitted to the full the wretched conditions under which the people lived and the necessity of dealing with the problem itself.

Now, although this statement will be challenged, it cannot be fairly said that the Government have shown any lack of consideration in this matter. Some years ago Mr. Arthur Balfour persuaded Parliament to make a free grant of £1,250,000 (and this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has since been supplemented by a very large sum) for railways to traverse some of these districts. The lines are all open for traffic and are being worked by the great trunk lines of the country. In 1891 Mr. Balfour took another step, and one which may yet turn out to be the means of dealing effectively with the difficulty —he established the Congested Districts Board. This body consists of certain gentlemen selected by the Irish Government, who are charged with the duty of assisting the people of these districts in a variety of ways. They have an annual income of £42,000 derived from a capital sum taken from the Irish Church surplus. Beyond all doubt their work has been of importance—not alone in the paths they have gone, but in pointing out the possibilities. Two or three things must be said at this point. The first is that something ought to be done to make the holdings occupied by these people more adequate than they now are. The land at the best is wretched in character. But reclaimed bog grows good potatoes, and, if the potato crop turns out well trouble diminishes. The Congested Districts Board have already pointed the way in this respect. They have purchased certain small estates, and, by getting rid of the grazing tenants, they have been enabled to add the land thus acquired to the small and inadequate holdings of the tenants. They have repaired the cabins, made farm roads, mended the fences and built schools. And when all this has been done, they have sold the holdings to the tenants under the Land Purchase Acts—with the result that they pay as a terminable annuity to the state for the enlarged holdings very little more than they paid to the old landlord as a perpetual rent for the smaller area. If the Congested Districts Board had never done anything but this one thing—and it has done much more—it would have fully justified its existence. Of course, this remedy is not capable of universal application. But in a great many districts the grazing land is there. No one proposes to take it without the fullest compensation. But, if ever state interference could be justified, it would be here and under these circumstances. With more money to work upon, the Congested Districts Board could do much, even without compulsion.

But this is only the first step in the work. These people have many splendid virtues. They endure hardship, suffering and hunger under the conviction that it is the will of God. This for them is enough. But whatever their virtues may be, they know nothing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the arts by which a country prospers. They are not in reality farmers. They are in fact fifty or a hundred years behind even the rest of Ireland. With enlarged holdings will come the necessity for some form of agricultural education. And even then the land will not suffice for the people. Centres such as Carna and Carraroe will have somehow or other to be thinned out, and cottage industries introduced. All this the Congested Districts Board have on hand. Their operations are only limited by their financial resources. It is money that is required. And for the enlargement of holdings it is not a free grant, but a loan, that is needed. I believe that those who are responsible for the government of Ireland are fully alive to the problem and are anxious to solve it. No miracle can be worked. Time, money, firmness and patience are alike necessary. And as it is only an extension of work already sanctioned and begun that is necessary, I hope and believe that the present Parliament will not cease to exist without laying the foundation for better days in these long-neglected and, in many cases, beautiful regions. It ought not to be said that:

> "In a climate soft as a mother's smile,
> With a soil fruitful as God's love,
> The Irish people starve."

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRIES BOARD.

Next session will probably see the re-introduction of the Agriculture and Industries Bill—a measure which was introduced and withdrawn by Mr. Gerald Balfour in 1897. This bill proposes to establish an Agriculture and Industries Department, with a special board, whose duty it will be to foster and encourage the backward agriculture of certain districts, and to aid in establishing industries that will act as a supplement thereto. The measure has much more support outside Parliament than within its walls. It is the outcome of a remarkable movement* which culminated in what was called the "Recess Committee"—a body composed of men of all parties who place their trust for the future of Ireland in the development of its industrial resources, rather than in political reforms. The report of the Recess Committee undoubtedly produced a great effect upon public opinion. It showed how much the state had done on the Continent of Europe in aid of agriculture and other industries, and how little had been done in

* This movement was fully described in an article entitled "The Irish Question in a New Light," contributed to the January (1893) number of this REVIEW by the Right Hon Horace Plunkett, M P, Chairman of the Recess Committee and President of the Irish Agricultural Organization Society —ED. N. A. R.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this respect for Ireland. A great impetus has also been given to the movement by the steady growth and success of the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, a body which is steadily reforming the butter industry by means of co-operative creameries and other agencies. There can be no doubt that there is a wide field for operations of this character. Much is being done by the organization I have referred to and by the Congested Districts Board. And the establishment of popular County and District Government will enable more to be done. In this work the state may very well be asked to bear a part, and the carriage of the bill abandoned in 1897 would be another large step in the material regeneration of the country.

From what I have said, it will be apparent that, so far as the real needs of Ireland are concerned, there has been no neglect by the Legislature during the present Parliament. The alternative policy to Home Rule is being steadily brought to the front and applied. A policy such as that which has been pursued without faltering has, of course, given rise to much searching of heart among many Unionists. The land-owning class, many of them overwhelmed by mortgages and family charges, have not welcomed the Land Act of 1896. Nobody expected they would do so. And it would be idle to deny that the calamities by which many of them have been overtaken have elicited a volume of sympathy which made the task of the Government very difficult. Similarly, as regards Local Government, the old governing class, and a section of the extreme Orangemen in Ulster, have bitterly resented what means in reality their disestablishment. But the feeling of resentment has been by no means universal, and sensible men everywhere have realized that it was impossible to maintain the old non-representative and exclusive system of County and District Government. But the Government, undeterred by abuse, and heedless of threats, which, of course, were as impotent as they were foolish, have carried out the pledges given since 1886, and a few months now will see the local affairs of Ireland committed to the management of the Irish people. A great experiment truly, and one assuredly worth making. I am told it will prove the prelude to Home Rule, and that its successful working will ensure the larger and more ambitious scheme. This view is held by Lord Spencer and a large number of English Liberals. My own view, however, is of a directly opposite character. The Home

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rule movement has gone back—not forward. The death of Mr. Gladstone must also tend to further disintegration on the question. For old Liberals who never felt sure of their policy, but who were devoted and with good cause to "the Grand Old Man," will now feel free to act on their own views. They will say—they are already saying*—that the Local Government Bill is as much of Home Rule as they ever really wished to confer upon Ireland, and they will weaken the ranks of the Home Rule Liberals by this plea. It is also becoming more and more apparent that any real alliance of the British Liberals with the Irish Home Rule party is out of the question. It is not only on the question of education that their ways lie apart. They approach other questions from wholly different standpoints. And even if the views here expressed were baseless, I see no hope for an Irish Parliament within any period to which a practical politician cares to look forward. Given the defeat of the Unionist party at the next election—a not impossible contingency—what then? Where is the leader of the Liberals? Where is the Liberal policy? Under no conceivable circumstances can the Liberals sweep the country. A majority of 30 or 40, inclusive of the Irish vote, is the utmost they can hope for. Will they satisfy the Irish demand? If so, shipwreck awaits them on a Home Rule bill. Will they refuse to do so? They will be out of office in a week through the opposition of the Irish vote.

Under all these circumstances, it is something for men who care more for the welfare of the people than for systems of government to feel that much is being accomplished for Ireland, that grievances are being redressed, wrongs righted and justice done. This is what is going on in Ireland under the auspices of the Unionist party, to the satisfaction of all well-wishers of the country.

T. W. RUSSELL.

* See Mr. Burton's letter to the Hon. R Spencer, East Herts Election, June 21, 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHAKESPEARE IN 1898.

BY EDMUND GOSSE.

SOME time ago, Mr. Swinburne prophesied that 1894 would in time to come be known as "Walter Scott's year," because, although much that was curious and interesting appeared during the same months, nothing equalled the splendor which was thrown on the memory of Scott by the circumstance of the accidentally simultaneous publication of the "Journal" and other illuminating material. It is not easy to diagnose the state of literary health while the symptoms are upon us, and, as a matter of fact, no one, so far as I am aware, has noted that we are passing through a complete crisis of Shakespearianism. But it is true; and the concentrated activity of Shakespeare scholars in 1898 has been so remarkable that I, in my turn, prophesy that this will be known as "Shakespeare's year." This renewed and impassioned study of a poet who seemed almost hopelessly hackneyed, weighed to the ground under the terrible apparatus of the commentators, is a very striking phenomenon. Here we have a writer so over-written and over-expounded (one might have said) that it was impossible to produce a new sensation regarding him, and behold! a fresh class of students rises who treat his glorious works as if they were reading them for the first time.

This, indeed, is what strikes me as uniting in a common purpose the otherwise very dissimilar and even, on minor points, opposed critics and historians to whose labors I am about to draw attention in some detail. All of them approach their great theme as some farmer on the slopes of Vesuvius might visit his field after an eruption. It seems hopeless at first; here is the spot, indeed, but all is covered with scoriæ and dust, all is hidden with light and volatile matter steadily super-imposed. It would be madness to waste top dressings on that white and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sterile coat of ash, and the Italian farmer is tempted to leave the place altogether, and seek fresh land. But he does better; he removes the scoriæ—it is surprising how light they are—and he finds the rich fields beneath practically unhurt. That, as it seems to me, is the central instinct which has dictated to the latest students of Shakespeare their attitude. They found the poet buried under conjectures and supposition; theories of all kinds had been started, flying in the wind and dropping, almost unfelt, on to other theories, and helping to conceal and sterilize the truth.

Twenty years ago there was a great and useful movement in the sceptical direction. The text of Shakespeare had been treated with a senseless superstition. Every scene of every play had been, without question, attributed, exactly as we possess it, to his inspired pen, and no sort of investigation was made into the sources of our authority. The doubting scholars came suddenly upon us with their tests and formulas; they pointed out discrepancies and exposed illusions. There were proposed, and for the moment accepted, standards of versification. At such and such periods of his life, Shakespeare wrote thus and thus. If we found in his works of a certain date other methods of composition, then those passages were not written by Shakespeare or not at that time. An immense amount of good was done by these investigations, but they were carried much too far. People would take a play and, by using their verse-tests, declare that this scene was written by Kyd and that act by Peele. The passion grew by what it fed on, and if all the conjectures which were set forth had been accepted, in the lump, not one single unmutilated work, except perhaps "The Tempest," would have been left to Shakespeare's credit. Then there came a reaction, and Mr. Swinburne merrily quizzed all those good folk who counted verses with their fingers because, he said, they had no ears to count with. The school of chemical experiment applied to poetry fell into discredit; but it had done excellent service. It had exploded a great many errors, it had observed a great many un-noticed facts, and above all it had removed the tiresome superstition of Shakespeare's being a kind of inspired idiot, who blindly produced a body of absolutely perfect work without any of the living inequalities of an artist.

Among the manifestations of the new Shakespearians of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last few months—all, it must be remembered, working unconsciously of the labors of the rest—the earliest place in time must be given to Mr. Sidney Lee. This gentleman has for seven years held the highly responsible office of Editor of the "Dictionary of National Biography," which he took up when the severity of the task proved too much for the health of Mr. Leslie Stephen, who had founded it in 1882. Mr. Sidney Lee is one of the most competent and brilliant of the younger school of English writers, and the rigor of his duties, their constant strain on his attention, and the width of range which they demand, have marvellously edged and tempered his intellect. This Spartan training among facts and dates, when, as I once heard the Master of the Temple very wittily say, the motto of a writer has to be the funereal one, "No flowers—by request," is as beneficial to certain minds as the laxity of journalism is hurtful. Mr. Sidney Lee has certainly thriven upon it like the *herb marjoram,* that must be crushed if it is to grow. His biographies have become more and more admirable, until his "Shakespeare," which, happily, perhaps, came so late in alphabetical order, is a masterpiece.

This biography may be called an "article," but it is really lengthy enough to form a book, and I am, in fact, enabled to state that it will before very long be published in separate form, with additional illustrative matter. It is not, I hope, a breach of confidence to announce that in this extended form it will be found to contain interesting new information about Thomas Thorpe and the W. H. of the "Sonnets," which will certainly attract a good deal of attention to one of Mr. Lee's appendices. It may be found that he has solved at last the mystery of the publication of those poems, as so many mysteries are removed, by showing that no mystery exists. To Mr. Lee's "Life of Shakespeare," as it already lies before the public, I must however confine myself.

If we ask ourselves what it is that Mr. Lee has accomplished in his remarkable biographical monograph, the answer appears to be that he has resumed in a perfectly sober and logical survey the facts about Shakespeare's life as they lie scattered over a thousand diverse sources. While other biographers of the poet have endeavored by a more or less reckless network of ingenious guesses to form a plausible portrait of him, not daring to trust alone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to what is certainly and finally known, Mr. Lee has had the courage to discard conjecture altogether, and to content himself by drawing into focus all the disjointed facts. This had been in measure done before. It was first attempted in 1709 by the poet laureate, Nicholas Rowe; Malone, a century later, searched systematically among the official papers at Stratford; while, above all, the late Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps spent a lifetime in collecting what Mr. Lee calls "massive material" for a biography. Far be it from me to seem to speak disrespectfully of that estimable scholar, whose courteous hospitality I once enjoyed with profit in the extraordinary sort of Indian village in which he stored his literary treasures above Brighton. But the mind of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps had no leaning toward the synthetic; he could not marshal his information. A fact to him was what a primrose was to Peter Bell, and his "Outline of a Life of Shakespeare" is one of the most chaotic books in existence. The results of important research are there, but they lie in distressing confusion.

It is to Mr. Sidney Lee's praise that, without the use of conjecture—that dangerous critical narcotic—and clinging as close to every spar of fact as Halliwell-Phillipps did, he has yet contrived to make out an intelligible story and to minimize the superstitious or fabulous part of the chronicle. To give an instance: A vast and needless mystery has been made about Shakespeare's wealth, as if the formation of such a fortune as he retired upon were the result of witch-craft. Turn to Mr. Sidney Lee's narrative, and the miracles of Shakespeare's money making become perfectly plain sailing. It is an exceedingly interesting episode in Elizabethan economics, and as we read the careful evidence the biographer puts together, we see how much exaggeration there has been in the treatment of the poet's financial adventures. Shakespeare was about as well off as any other successful actor-manager of the day, but certainly not abnormally prosperous. For instance, we can make out that, from the time of his adopting the profession until 1599, Shakespeare's average annual revenue was about 6,500 dollars of our money to-day. After that date he was much better off; before he retired, his yearly profit from his share of the theatres amounted to at least 25,000 dollars of to-day. This is a large income; but it pales before the profits of a contemporary manager, Edward Alleyn, who was able, without impoverishing his family, to purchase the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manor of Dulwich for £10,000 (equal to half a million dollars to-day), and to devote it to public uses. The receipts of the play houses were exceedingly large, and Mr. Lee thinks that the managers bought plays very cheaply. Ten pounds (500 dollars to-day) is the very highest price for a play recorded in the Elizabethan and Jacobean actors' accounts. It is important to realize, and Mr. Lee states it with minute lucidity, that Shakespeare's fortune was made, not by the writing of his plays, but by his admirable conduct of theatrical business.

While Mr. Sidney Lee was preparing this clear and exact biography of Shakespeare, which is certainly the most complete which we possess, an eminent foreign critic was composing a work inspired by much the same order of ideas, although carried out along very different lines. Dr. Georg Brandes has hitherto been, perhaps, less known to English-speaking readers than to any similar class on the Continent of Europe. Taking France out of the question, Dr. Brandes is certainly at this moment the most eminent foreign critic alive. He is a Dane, and his training was performed in the University of Copenhagen, where he would undoubtedly now be Professor of Belles Lettres if it were not for certain political and religious objections on which it is needless to dilate here. Enough to say that he has produced a curious deadlock, for if the Government will not appoint Dr. Brandes the University will accept no one else, and for a quarter of a century the chair has consequently been in abeyance. Dr. Brandes began to write in the manner which he has now made characteristic about thirty years ago. He was greatly influenced by Sainte-Beuve, and later perhaps by Paul de St. Victor. He was the earliest of the long line of those who have elucidated and interpreted Ibsen, and he has made the great movements of literature in the nineteenth century the study of his life. He has always written with admirable competency on Scandinavian, French and German writers, and he has occasionally adventured on English literature as well. In 1875, as a volume of his great critical work on the nineteenth century, he published his "Romanticism in England," which, however, has never been considered the most original portion of the enterprise. He has produced, moreover, an excellent monograph on Lord Beaconsfield. But English literature has, until now, not been by any means Dr. Brandes' most familiar province.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Armed with long practice in seizing upon the spirit of literary artists from the mere sympathetic study of their lives and writings, in modern instances where academic tradition has had no opportunity to lay down hard and fast opinions, Dr. Brandes has at last come to the conquest of the greatest poet of the world, and the one around whom most of what we call "accepted opinion" has crystallized. He has taken Shakespeare exactly as he has for thirty years been in the habit of taking modern writers like Victor Hugo or Björnson or Heine, and he has grappled with him face to face. He has said to him: "I will not let you go, until you reveal to me the secret of your being." But the first difficulty which confronted him was the lack of abundant and trustworthy information. Of all recent writers, certainly of all in the first rank from Goethe and Byron and Châteaubriand onward, we have full, and in many cases excessive and bewildering, information. As time goes on, the extreme minuteness of our knowledge of contemporary men of genius will tend increasingly to embarrass and overburden criticism. But of the great writers of earlier times our acquaintance, apart from their published works, is usually extremely meagre. How little we certainly know of the detail of the life of Dante, of Cervantes, even of Moliere! It has become the fashion to say that we know next to nothing of that of Shakespeare, and so commentators have thought it needful to weave a web of fabulous conjecture round his name. But to Dr. Brandes, as to Mr. Lee, it has seemed that, by starting in a patient and logical spirit from the mass of existing documents and data, the outline of Shakespeare's career can quite intelligibly be sketched.

Those who read Dr. Brandes' handsome volumes, competently translated under the revision of Mr. William Archer, must recollect that what they have before them was not originally intended for English students. It was published, as all Dr. Brandes' books are, simultaneously in Danish and in German, and it is addressed to readers in the whole north and east of Europe, from Rotterdam to Archangel, and from Trieste to Bergen. If it had been written for English people, it must have dwelt more minutely on the predecessors of Shakespeare. Dr. Brandes is evidently not a specialist about Webster or about Ford. But for foreign readers the great thing is to distinguish Shakespeare from the group, to stand so far away as practically to see nothing defi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nitely but Shakespeare. This is a work which demanded a foreign critic, and where Dr. Brandes has been so happy is in the exact vision he has been able to reproduce of an isolated Shakespeare, lifted, as an English commentator now-a-days scarcely dares to lift him, so high above his contemporaries that they scarcely count. This is not the whole truth, but it is a face of the truth, and the freshness of the Danish critic's standpoint, the vigor and novelty of his impressions, and the determination he shows to present the poet before us as a living figure, make his monograph, in its cunning mixtures of biography and criticism, the best popular or general portrait of Shakespeare yet given to a Continental audience, certainly, and perhaps even to an English one. In his first volume he appears to me rarely to go amiss; in the second, I confess, I find his interpretations of the plays occasionally fantastic.

The charge of forming a judgment independently of the study of contemporary Elizabethan literature cannot, at any rate, be brought against Mr. George Wyndham. The width of reading exemplified by the Introduction to this gentleman's edition of the Poems of Shakespeare has astonished all those who have given a longer time than he and a more unbroken attention to the same "lovely argument." Mr. Wyndham, like another George two hundred years ago, the young poet George Stepney, has shown an erudition which "makes greybeards blush." He has been known to society as a young man of fashion, to politicians as a juvenile Member of Parliament, who, trained originally under Mr. Arthur Balfour, has awakened the highest anticipations. A year or two ago, the mode in which he edited North's "Plutarch" caused more than a ripple on literary opinion in London, but it is safe to say that no one expected Mr. George Wyndham to emerge so suddenly and so completely as he now has done from "the mob of gentlemen who write with ease."

The poems of Shakespeare consist in the main, as any one knows, of three works—of "Venus and Adonis," a love story; of "Lucrece," a narrative merged in a long moral tirade; and of the "Sonnets." In early days the first two of these vastly exceeded the third in popularity; during Shakespeare's lifetime there appeared seven editions of "Venus and Adonis," five of "Lucrece," and only one of the "Sonnets." In the present century this order has been reversed, and while a whole library has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed around the Sonnets, the two narrative poems have been neglected more than any other portion of their author's repertory. Mr. Wyndham starts on the assumption, which is contrary to accepted opinion, that the only way in which these three works can profitably be studied is in unison. Here, merely as an instance of that simultaneous attraction to the positive view of Shakespeare's character which I have indicated as the note of criticism this year, I may venture to point out that I had myself, in words published a few weeks before Mr. Wyndham's edition, but certainly not seen by him, emphasized the identity of tone between "Venus and Adonis" and the early sonnets, in the pathos of the vain pursuit of adolescent beauty.

As far as the Sonnets are concerned, Mr. Wyndham calls us back from the casuists and the guess-work pedants who forget the poetry in their eagerness to tie it down, cadence by cadence, to some theory of their own. He is freer than any commentator has been—since Armitage Brown in 1838 first began to bewilder us with autobiographical conjectures—from prejudice in favor of one particular hypothesis of subject and address. Even Mr. Sidney Lee is not quite satisfied to leave us alone, but ingeniously argues in favor of Southampton's being Shakespeare's ardent and mysterious friend, the "Master-Mistress of his passion." Mr. Wyndham, not uninterested by the enigma, is yet content to state it, and gives the Southampton and the Herbert arguments impartially, for us to employ our idle moments in discussing. He most justly considers that these personal facts or fancies are no more than the discovery of marble mines in Carrara, or buried statues in Sicily, might be to a great Italian sculptor of the Renaissance; that their prime importance is the stimulus which they gave to the sublime expression of his own individual genius. The position Mr. Wyndham takes up, as one who through a jarring tribe of gesticulating professors leads the neophyte straight to the work of art itself, and bids him contemplate it undisturbed, is one requiring no little courage. Less learning than he himself has proved would scarcely justify it, yet it is completely justified. The publication of this edition of Shakespeare's Poems makes a certain epoch, and clears the ground of a large mass of entirely dead material which has cumbered the ground for sixty years.

With the earliest months of this year, the most illustrious of American editors of Shakespeare, Mr Horace Howard Furness,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sent forth the eleventh volume of his Variorum Edition, that almost superhuman labor on which he has been engaged so long. This volume is entirely devoted to "The Winter's Tale." No new feature or fresh critical departure marks Mr. Furness' latest appearance, and yet we are quite justified in claiming this veteran among those of the younger school who have set their mark on 1898. Mr. Furness, in his solid and patient progress almost overwhelmed sometimes, like Atlas, "by the too-vast orb of his fate," has prepared the way for these realistic and cautious students. Common sense, an incessant balancing of the exact weight of authority, an impatience of flummery and fustian, these have always been the features of his vast compilation, and have given it that unique value which is admitted all over the world. Possibly because the temper of readers was never before so ripe for it, the "Winter's Tale" seems edited with a greater verve and a more triumphant solution of difficulties than any of its predecessors. This I believe to be an illusion; it is we who have changed, not Mr. Furness; he has at last come into his own. Hardly any wish more pious can at this present date be breathed by those who love English literature, than that Mr. Furness may be given health and opportunity to bring his splendid enterprise to a conclusion.

The "sweet o' the year" of Shakespeare is not bounded even by the notable contributions which I have already mentioned. Less distinctly to my purpose, but not to be overlooked, is the ingenious treatise on the forms of sport known to Shakespeare which Mr. Justice Madden has lately issued; and at the moment that I write there are appearing in the *Saturday Review*, a series of articles, by Mr. Frank Harris, on the personal temperament of the poet as revealed in the texture of the plays. Extraordinary is the vitality and richness of the genius out of whose natural stem so many clusters of fresh foliage can still spring within a single year. For half a century after the death of Shakespeare no definite recognition of his mastery can be discovered. Dryden, to his own immortal honor, first had the courage to claim for the author of "Hamlet" a place among poets which was absolutely transcendent. But he did not carry opinion universally with him, and as a mere curiosity of literature, it would be amusing to reprint what Rymer, the official critic of the reign of William III. found to object to in the conduct and language of Shakespeare's plays It was he who, in a fine burst of indignation, declared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that "Othello" was a play so faultily constructed and so ignorantly conceived, that it was a disgrace that the players should be allowed to wear the King's uniform when they acted in the part of Iago.

With the reign of Queen Anne, the genuine study of Shakespeare began, and while Addison was reading the plays with rapture and awe, the text was almost simultaneously attracting the attention of Rowe and of Pope, of Sewell and of Theobald. From that time onward, the toil of elucidation has never ceased, but one humdrum scholar after another has succumbed to the irresistible enchantment. A century and a half have exactly passed since the least humble and perhaps the least competent, but certainly not the least celebrated, of Shakespeare's editors, Bishop Warburton, issued the text that passed for authoritative till Dr. Johnson's took its place. One hundred years ago, George Steevens was the reigning editor of the poet, hotly pursued by Isaac Reed. It would pass the memory of man, and is probably known only to Mr. Furness, how many other phantoms have walked since then over the marble of Shakespeare's tomb. They have passed into the land where names are shadows; he is as young, and strong, and (to borrow Coleridge's phrase) as "thousand-souled" as ever. Indeed, as masterpieces are living things and grow long after the decease of those who create them, it may without paradox be said that at no time within three hundred years has Shakespeare been so imperiously vital as he is to-day. The sudden output of vivid simultaneous commentary on his life and work which it has seemed interesting to draw attention to is not to be looked upon as exhausting the theme with any abrupt finality. To fresh generations of minds, Shakespeare will present facets which the keenest of living critics cannot perceive to-day. We shall steadily learn to know him more accurately, more solidly, more sensibly. But what does seem to me likely is that several years or even some decades may pass before we make much advance on the ground so vigorously won in 1898.

EDMUND GOSSE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GREAT LAKES AND OUR COMMERCIAL SUPREMACY.

BY JOHN FOORD.

THE commercial primacy of the world belongs to the country that can produce the cheapest pig iron. For this carries with it the ability to command the cheapest machinery and the cheapest transportation, which, in their turn, render possible the conversion of raw materials into manufactured products and the delivery of these to the consumer at the lowest attainable range of cost. Iron and steel are produced in the least favored localities of the United States as cheaply as in Great Britain; in the most favored localities they are produced more cheaply. Yet, in the very centre of American iron and steel production the ore and the fuel have to be brought together from points a thousand miles apart, while in Great Britain a hundred miles is quite an exceptionally wide interval between the two. How has this formidable handicap of 900 miles of transportation been overcome? How has it become possible to produce a ton of pig iron in Pittsburg to-day at about the same price as the ore entering into that iron cost fourteen years ago? To be strictly accurate, the answer would have to enumerate a variety of causes, including improvements in blast furnace construction and practice, and economies in the production of coke. But underlying them all is the controlling influence which determines the cost of the ore—the depth of water in the Lake channels. By every foot that this depth has been increased the distance between Duluth and Cleveland has been virtually shortened by 100 miles, so that in the 40 years in which the depth of water on St. Clair Flats has been doubled, and a navigable depth of 20 feet has been established in the St. Mary's Falls Canal, the cost of transporting a ton of ore on the Lakes has come down from four mills to six-tenths of a mill per ton per mile

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Time was, and that but recently, when Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey and Ohio found within their own borders most of the ore that was needed to supply their furnaces. In the census year 1880, the mines of these four States yielded 4,243,372 long tons of ore, the total product of the United States being but 7,120,362 tons. In that same year the Lake region contributed only 1,677,814 tons, or 23.6 per cent. of the total output. In 1896 the total ore production of the country was 16,005,449 tons, to which the contribution of the four States named was only 1,456,-740 tons, while that of the Lake region was 10,566,359 tons, or 66 per cent. of the whole. Last year the total shipments of ore by Lake from all the Lake ports aggregated 13,681,522 net tons. In other words, the expansion of the iron and steel industry of the United States has become contingent on the supply of ore from Minnesota, Wisconsin and the upper peninsula of Michigan. The question of whether the ore should go to meet the coal or the coal to meet the ore has been answered in favor of the movement of the ore, for two reasons: First, because of the greater nearness of the coal region to the seaboard and to the great primary markets for finished steel; and, next, because the problem of cheap ore carriage is greatly simplified by the fact that the coal required for general use in the Northwest supplies, in part at least, a return freight. Were the coal taken to the ore, the whole freight movement, except in grain and lumber, would be in one direction, while, as matters stand, against ore shipments of 13,000 tons, the tonnage of coal going in the opposite direction is about 6,500,000 tons.

But for the water transportation furnished by the Great Lakes, it is safe to say that the Superior mines would never have been developed, and the rapid advance now being made by the United States toward the industrial supremacy of the world would have been impossible. There are, it is true, practically unlimited supplies of ore and coal in the States of Alabama, Tennessee and Georgia, but the ores are mostly what is known as non-Bessemer in quality, having, as a rule, too much phosphorus to admit of their profitable employment in the making of steel. In addition to the variable supply of phosphorus in the Southern ores, they are much less rich in iron than those of Lake Superior. The advantage which rich ores enjoy over "lean" ores is cumulative, resulting in a smaller cost per ton of product, because of the saving in fuel, fluxes, labor cost, and furnace space. There are no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finer Bessemer ores in the world than those which the Lake Superior ranges yield, a fact which is becoming painfully apparent to the British iron master, who has to go to Spain and Sweden to supplement the deficiency of his native ore. Even at a rapidly increasing scale of consumption, the period of their probable exhaustion can hardly be said to belong to the arena of practical discussion. It is but six years since the discovery of the Mesabi range nearly doubled the productive possibilities of the Lake mines, and developed a system of surface mining at whose rapidity and economy of operation the world has not ceased to wonder. Here, then, is the very keystone of the rapidly expanding structure of the industrial greatness of the United States. The centre of steel production may change from Pittsburg to the south shore of Lake Erie; the head of Lake Superior, even, may come to be the seat of furnaces and rolling mills to supply the needs of the Northwest; but, be the ore converted where it may, the five great ranges of Marquette, Gogebic, Menominee, Vermilion and Mesabi will continue to supply, as they do to-day, the raw material for most of the steel produced in the United States.

An expenditure of between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 will represent the contribution of the Government of the United States toward bringing the head of Lake Superior as near to the foot of Lake Erie as the latter is, in point of cost of transportation, to Pittsburg. The work has been, on the whole, intelligently and honestly done. Much of the money expended has gone to the deepening of the Lake harbors, a work no less essential than the deepening of the Lake channels. Of these latter in which are found the natural obstacles to navigation between Buffalo and Duluth, there are three—the Detroit River, and beyond it Lake St. Clair and St. Clair River, connecting Lake Erie with Lake Huron, and the St. Mary's River, connecting Lake Huron and Lake Superior. The draft of vessels navigating the lower Lakes has always been controlled by the depth of water on St. Clair Flats. The St. Clair River originally entered Lake St. Clair through several different mouths or passes. Previous to 1858 the depth of water by way of the North Pass was only 9½ feet. Improvements at the South Pass, concluded at about that time, provided a depth of water of nearly 12 feet. The St. Clair Flats Canal, projected in 1856 and finished in 1871, gave a depth of 13 feet, which by 1874 was increased to 16 feet In 1887 the work of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deepening the canal and its approaches to 20 feet was begun, and is now practically complete. On the lower Detroit River, the channel at what is known as the Lime-Kiln Crossing could not be depended on for more than 13 feet of water. The improvement of this channel began in 1874 and progressed from year to year till by 1890 a navigable passage 440 feet wide and 20 feet deep was finally secured. This is to-day the most important water highway in the world, the vessel tonnage traversing it being four times as great as that passing through the Suez Canal, and as much as the entrances and clearances in the foreign trade of Liverpool and London combined.

But the trade of the lower Lakes could never have approached its present dimensions had the trade of Lake Superior remained undeveloped, and the rapids of the river at Sault Ste. Marie continued to obstruct navigation. The first ship canal to turn these rapids was constructed by a private corporation under a land grant from the State of Michigan. It was begun in 1853, and opened to navigation in 1855. Its cost was about a million dollars, and it was a little over a mile in length, with an available depth of 12 feet. How limited was the commerce thus provided for may be inferred from the fact that in 1864 the average registered tonnage of the vessels passing through the canal was 405 tons. In 1870 the United States Government made its first appropriation for improving the canal, so as to obtain a 16-foot navigation. The new lock was open for business in 1881, but had not been five years in use before the need of further improvements became manifest. These began in 1886, and have finally resulted in the construction of a new lock 800 feet long and 100 feet wide throughout, with 21 feet of water on the sills. The prism of the canal has also been deepened to correspond with the available draft of water in the lock. Supplemented by the improvement of the Hay Lake Channel, from the canal to Lake Huron, this work supplied the last important link of a 20-foot channel between Buffalo and Duluth. In 1891, General O. M. Poe, who has been identified for 40 years with the improvement of the lake channels, reported that an expenditure of $3,339,567 would be required to remove the remaining obstructions to a minimum depth of 20 feet in all the lake passes. This work is well under way, and the results are already apparent. During the season of 1890 a little over 9,000,000 tons of freight passed through the St. Mary's River; in 1897

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the total was close on 19,000,000 tons. Speaking of the former aggregate and the corresponding figures for the Detroit River, General Poe remarked: "The increase in the available depth of channels on the lakes from 9½ feet in 1852 to 16 feet in 1882 developed this commerce, and it is only reasonable to expect that a further increase of 4 feet will make a corresponding increase in the shipping. The results are most noticeable, perhaps, in the character of the vessels employed in the carrying trade. These have increased in size and seaworthiness until they form a fleet which has not its equal upon any inland waters on the face of the globe. Of large capacity and great power, regardless of wind or weather, steamers of the prevailing type bear their cargoes to and from ports a thousand miles apart with the precision of railroad trains, each of them transporting at once more than ten ordinary freight trains. Surely, such a commerce deserves every aid and encouragement that can be extended to it. Give it channels practically navigable upon a draft of 20 feet, and it needs no prophet to foretell a wonderful growth; but only a prophet can foretell its degree."

The fact is to be noted, however, that the increase of Lake traffic since 1890 has been almost entirely traceable to the increase due to Lake Superior. The gain of 9,000,000 tons passing through the Detroit River is more than covered by the gain of 10,000,000 tons passing through the St. Mary's Falls Canal. Of course, that part of the freight movement of Superior whose port is Chicago or Milwaukee does not enter into the returns of Lower Lake traffic. There is even a considerable current of freight—that of ore from Menominee and Escanaba to Chicago—which, passing through neither the upper nor the lower of the great passes of the lakes, escapes tabulation. Keeping in mind these qualifications, it is interesting to note that of the 18,982,755 net tons of freight sent through the St. Mary's Falls Canal during the navigation season of 1897, 10,633,715 net tons were iron ore. In 1890 the ore tonnage passing through the canal was 4,774,768 tons, so that of the total increase of 10,000,000 tons in the canal traffic since 1890, 6,000,000 tons have been in iron ore. It seems a clear case of the facilities creating the trade; but it is more than this, it is a satisfactory example of intelligently directed public expenditure lending new vitality to private enterprise, and laying the foundation of national supremacy in the fundamental department of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manufacturing industry. During the 40 odd years of continuous improvement of the Lake channels the ship-builder has pressed close on the heels of the Government engineer. In fact, the builder has frequently been somewhat ahead of his pioneer. Steamers requiring when loaded a given draft of water have always been on the stocks while the corresponding depth of channel was being secured, and have often been afloat before it was forthcoming. The 20-foot minimum is, by no means, a finality; but there would be little profit in its increase till the Lake harbors have been deepened to conform to the channels. The process of harbor improvement is now going on, and as the Lake steamer requires but a foot or two of water under her keel the new ones have been built for a mean draft, when loaded, of 17 feet. On this draft the largest of them, measuring 475 feet over all, 50 feet beam and 29 feet deep, can carry 6,500 to 6,750 gross tons of ore. This is the latest phase of the evolution of a type that had its origin some 50 years ago, when the capacity of the largest of Lake craft was 600 tons. In the early seventies a steamer of 1,300 tons occupied the front rank; by 1885 the maximum had risen to 2,500 tons, and a steamer of 3,000 tons was a monster, about the possibility of whose profitable employment practical men had grave doubts. Most of the steamers composing the Rockefeller fleet, and constructed within the last few years, are built to carry 5,000 tons on a draft of 17 feet. No such steamer could have got into Lake Superior 13 years ago; and, while the capacity of the Lake freighter has thus been doubled during a period comparatively short, the cost of building and running it has been reduced at a ratio of from 30 to 40 per cent. That is to say, the 5,000-ton steamer of to-day costs only $5 per ton to build, while the 2,500-ton steamer of 1885 cost $7 per ton; the coal cost per trip of the 5,000-ton steamer instead of being double that of the 2,500-ton steamer, does not average 25 per cent. more; and, while 16 round trips between Lake Superior and Lake Erie ports was considered a good season's work in 1885, 22 round trips are now merely a fair season's work. It will be perceived that, though the average freight rate on ore is less than half what it was in 1885, there may, for the modern type of vessel at least, still be a sufficient profit in the business.

With the increase in size and efficiency of the Lake steamers, the improvement in mining and transfer appliances has fairly kept

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pace. The open-pit mining, which has become possible on a large scale since the discovery of the Mesabi range, has reduced to a minimum the cost of taking the ore from the ground and placing it on a railroad car. To open a mine of this kind it is only necessary to strip off some 30 feet in depth of superincumbent soil and begin with a steam shovel or a "winze" the process of extracting the gigantic deposit of soft ore. The capacity of the steam shovel is nothing short of marvellous. Professor Tunell, who made a report to the Secretary of the Treasury on Lake commerce early this year, says that during one day in the summer of 1896 three steam shovels, working 14 hours each, dug and raised from the natural bed of the Oliver mine of the Mesabi range 10,700 gross tons, or 420 carloads of ore. Twenty-five-ton ore cars have been continuously loaded from the ore bed at the rate of 2½ minutes per car; the largest shovel, weighing 90 tons, with hoisting engines of 200 horse-power, has loaded as much as 5,825 tons, or 233 cars, in a day of ten hours. The average cost by this process of loading the ore into cars from the bed of the mine is easily within 5 cents per ton. It is calculated that since 8 tons of ore are uncovered for each yard of surface stripped off, and as stripping costs some 40 cents per cubic yard, an additional cost of 5 cents per ton must be added to the mining cost under this head. That makes the initial labor cost of Mesabi ore on the cars 10 cents per ton. The remaining cost consists of interest on and depreciation of mining plant, royalties and transportation.

The first step in the process of transportation consists of the 70 miles, more or less, from the mine to the shipping port. This is covered by railroads equipped with cars specially designed for the ore traffic, and with ore docks built as high as 57 feet above the water, from the pockets of which the ore falls through iron chutes into the holds of the vessels lying alongside. So expeditiously is the work of loading done that vessels frequently leave port with an ore cargo of 3,500 to 4,000 tons within two hours of the time of arriving at the dock. The work of unloading is effected with only less expedition. It is not more than 13 years since the only method of unloading was to use horse power to lift the ore from the hold in buckets, dump it into wheel-barrows, wheel it on the dock and empty it on the stock pile. To-day, on the new dock at Conneaut may be seen at work the most highly developed mechanical method of handling the ore. There is no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

longer any stock pile, but in its place a steel car capable of carrying 50 tons, into which the ore is delivered direct from the hold of the vessel. The apparatus of transfer consists of 12 great legs, divided into four separate groups of three machines each, running on a 20-foot track. Each leg spans five railroad tracks, and on the water side of the machine the boom extends to the further side of the vessel, permitting more than one bucket to operate in the same hatch. When all the legs are at work the capacity of this plant is between 900 and 1,000 tons per hour—a speed at which vessels of the 6,000-ton type can be unloaded in less than 7 hours, or within one-half the time which has been but recently regarded as the minimum. About all the manual labor that is expended on the ore in its passage from the mine to the furnace is called into requisition during the process of transfer from the freighter to the railroad car, and, as will be perceived, this quantity is a steadily diminishing one. As to the remaining cost of hauling the ore from Conneaut to Pittsburg, it is the expectation of the directors of the road to be able to reduce it below three mills per ton per mile and still leave a sufficient margin for a dividend. Low as this rate is, however, it would make all the difference between cheap ore and dear ore, if applied to the transportation between the head of Lake Superior and the Lake Erie port. A ton-mile rate of three mills from Duluth to Conneaut will result in a freight charge of $2.55, or a little more than the probable aggregate of all costs and profits on the ore from its place in the ground to the furnace at Pittsburg.

The whole process of extraction, transportation and transfer is a very instructive study in the potency of small economies for building up a great industry. Foreign observers have remarked that the higher rate of wages prevailing in the United States has compelled our manufacturers to exert themselves in so perfecting their equipment as to get rid of manual labor whenever that was practicable. This process has been specially manifest in all stages of the iron and steel industry. The steam shovel is a product of the same necessity as the mechanical apparatus which has minimized the cost of production at blast furnaces and rolling mills. The point that seems to escape the foreign observer is that it is in the last degree improbable that the Bessemer ores of Lake Superior can ever resume their old level of price. The tendency of late years has been to bring about a consolidation of interests be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween the mine owners and the iron and steel manufacturers—to eliminate not only the middleman in the ore market, but also the independent common carrier, whether by water or by rail. From the stripping of the mine to the production of the steel ingot, the effort has been to make but one continuous process, every stage of which should be under virtually the same direction, and at none of which should there be any tax paid in the shape of interest or dividends which does not inure to the profit of the combination. About one-third of the whole product of the Lake Superior mines is taken by the Carnegie Steel Company, and around this fact centre the influences which have given the ore situation its present shape and which are likely to make that shape a permanent one. The Carnegie establishment might be appraised at anywhere from thirty to fifty millions of dollars. It is a plant established on an enormous scale, and it belongs to the very essence of its success that it should be fully employed. There is much more profit in working such a plant to its full capacity on a low range of prices than in having only part of it employed at relatively higher prices. But to establish such prices for steel as will insure the full activity of works capable of consuming 4,000,000 tons of ore *per annum,* it is evidently necessary that the strictest economy should be observed at every step in the process of production, from the mine to the rolling-mill. It is equally necessary that the company should be sure of getting its ore at a fairly uniform price, since under any other condition it would be impossible to make large contracts extending over a considerable period of time. For the cultivation of a foreign trade it is specially necessary that there should be some degree of certainty as to the future price of raw material.

It is considerations like these that underlie the so-called "deal" made between the Carnegie and Rockefeller interests. Mr. Rockefeller is the largest owner of the mines of the Mesabi range, and, while the physical structure of the Mesabi ore renders its exclusive use in furnace practice impossible, 40 per cent. of it can be used in combination with harder and coarser ores. The agreement between the Carnegie Company and Mr. Rockefeller contemplates the taking of at least 1,200,000 tons of Mesabi ore every year, on the basis of a payment which is variously represented at a royalty of 25 cents per ton, or a payment of $1.05 per ton for the ore delivered over Mr. Rockefeller's railway at the Lake Superior port.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the latter case, to the mining royalty of 25 cents has been added a uniform transportation charge of 80 cents per ton, which includes the cost of providing the transfer facilities already outlined. In addition to the railroad from the mine to the shipping docks, Mr. Rockefeller owns the fleet required to carry the ore from the Lake Superior to the Lake Erie port. The agreement provides that the rate of freight to be paid for this service shall be the average rate of the season—a rate which steadily gravitates to between 50 and 60 cents per ton. At the Lake Erie port the ore is transferred to the Carnegie road, the Pittsburg, Bessemer & Lake Erie route from Conneaut to Pittsburg. A simple calculation will show that under such an agreement as that above indicated the Carnegie Company gets its soft ore delivered at the furnace at a price below the lowest at which Bessemer ore has ever been sold at Lake Erie ports, and is entirely independent of the changes of the market to which the ore accumulated there used to be subject. But, Mesabi ore being good for only 40 per cent. of the composition required for satisfactory furnace work, the other 60 per cent. had to be provided for in some similar manner. This explains the acquisition by the Carnegie interest of the great Norrie mine on the Gogebic range—the largest iron mine in the world—and of other properties yielding a like product. To avoid the risk of being exposed to a disastrous competition, other great iron and steel producers have made similar combinations with mine owners, so that, to all intents and purposes, the two great branches of the industry on which commercial supremacy is built have become one.

The question of controlling the steel market of the world is primarily one of ore, as Great Britain, which has to import about a third of its entire consumption, is finding out to its cost. It is because this question has been finally settled here, and all further progress can tend only to make the ore cheaper than it is to-day, that the statement may be hazarded that for generations to come the primacy of the United States in the production of iron and steel is manifestly secure.

JOHN FOORD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN JOINT HIGH COMMISSION.

BY A CANADIAN LIBERAL.

THE appointment of a Joint High Commission by the governments of Great Britain and the United States of America, charged with the duty of attempting an amicable and mutually satisfactory adjustment of all outstanding disputes, causes of irritation, and questions of commercial policy, between Canada and the United States, embracing trade relations, the sealing question, the Alaskan boundary question and the Atlantic and inland fisheries regulations, is an event of great importance. It is an emphatic indorsement by both governments of the principle of arbitration. It is a movement reflecting the best spirit of the highest existing form of civilization. Perhaps no diplomatic conference has ever been entrusted with more important functions. Upon the issue of its deliberations hang consequences of the deepest importance to the present, and consequences that will reach far down into the future, the unfolding of whose mighty issues mankind will watch with bated breath.

The propitious moment for intrusting these high duties to an international commission seems to have arrived. Events in their swift progress have brought the two great Anglo-Saxon powers into more harmonious relations. The dictates of reason, the ties of consanguinity, the bonds of a common language and race, and the high claims of religion and humanity have with sudden and startling effect swept away the prejudices, the animosities and the jealousies that have kept these two mighty nations apart, and in place of all these we have the dawn of an era of good will, and of a common desire to act for a common purpose from the highest of motives. The most important practical initial step in bringing these peoples together will be to remove the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

causes of friction and ill will that have existed between the two Anglo-Saxon commonwealths upon this continent. The Canadian Government is undoubtedly ready to enter upon this task in a broad-minded, liberal spirit. It is prepared to meet the United States half way, more than half way if necessary, and hopes to be received by the United States with the kindly and fair, if not the generous, consideration which a mighty nation of eighty millions of people can well afford to extend to a kindred commonwealth of but six millions.

The geographical relations of the territories of the United States and of Canada are of such a nature as to invite freedom of commercial intercourse. These countries are naturally drawn to each other by community of race, and similarity in their laws and institutions. Possessing a conterminous boundary, extending from ocean to ocean, and having common interests, it is only in their political autonomy that environment and natural conditions permit distinct and separate existence. Natural intimacy of association, if artificial barriers were withdrawn, would be greater between such groups of provinces and of States as the maritime provinces of Canada and the seaboard States of the Union—the provinces of Quebec and Ontario and the Middle States of the Union, the provinces of the Canadian Northwest and the States of the Mississippi Valley, and the province of British Columbia and the States of the Pacific slope—than would be the intimacy of association and commercial transactions between many of the groups of States in the American Union. The natural conditions that render intercourse desirable between the separate States of the American Union free from tariff restrictions or legislative impediment, will apply to any province in the Canadian confederation, and the mutual advantages that would result from absolutely untrammelled commercial intercourse between commonwealths north and commonwealths south of the boundary line would be of exactly the same character as those that result from the untrammelled intercourse that is now existing between all the States of the American Union. The potent influences that work in the direction of social and commercial intimacy and of substantial homogeneity can only be thwarted in their natural course by hostile tariff legislation, and the settled purpose on the part of one of the two governments, or of both, to defy nature.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Canadian statesmen have ever realized the importance of cultivating more liberal trade relations with the United States, and the present system, which deprives the two countries of the full enjoyment of the advantages which natural affinities would give if not interfered with, cannot justly be said to be due to Canadian policy or Canadian obstruction. Whatever differences of opinion may have existed in Canada as to the details of a commercial arrangement for broader trade relations, and as to how near it should approach a zollverein, there has been practically no difference of opinion as to the desirability of having those relations broadened to a greater or less extent.

The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was the consummation of an earnest desire upon the part of the people of British America to draw nearer in trade relations to the United States. The operation of this treaty during the twelve years that it remained in force was of a beneficent and mutually advantageous character. Its abrogation by the United States was in the highest degree regrettable. Modifications of the treaty, no doubt, might have been reasonable and desirable. Its provisions, which were confined to the free exchange of natural products, could no doubt have been extended with advantage. It was beyond question reasonable that such a proposition should have been made and fairly and dispassionately considered. An agreed list of manufactures could have been added to the list with mutual advantage, and the era of good will and commercial intimacy which was being developed under its operations could have been extended.

Following closely upon the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 came the Confederation of the British North American colonies. Efforts were almost immediately put forth by the authorities of the newly created Dominion to open negotiations for a renewal of reciprocal trade relations. These overtures on the part of Canada were not met by the United States authorities in a favorable spirit.

When the Liberal party of Canada came into power in 1873, no time was lost in arranging for the consideration of a renewal of reciprocal relations between the two countries by a joint British and Canadian Commission. The Hon. George Brown was sent to Washington as the representative of Canada, and was associated in the negotiations which followed with Sir E. Thornton,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the British Minister at Washington. The esult of these negotiations was an agreement between the Commissioners and the United States Executive upon a reciprocity treaty of a broad and liberal character, which embraced in its schedule for free exchange natural products, agricultural implements under a head of forty enumerations, and classifications of manufactures, thirty-seven in number. This treaty was rejected by the United States Senate. Had its provisions been adopted, the history of friction and ill feeling between the two peoples, arising from strained commercial relations, would not have required to be written.

Since the rejection of the Brown Draft Treaty by the United States Senate, overtures have upon one or two occasions been made by the Conservative Government which came into power in 1878, and remained at the head of Canadian affairs until 1896. Both Liberals and Conservatives concurred in the admission that abolition of trade restrictions to a greater or less extent was desirable. The Conservative feared to go beyond the application of the principle to natural products; the Liberal was willing to make a broader and more liberal treaty, embracing a sufficient list of manufactured articles to give a reasonable *quid pro quo* for concessions made by the United States in the admission of natural products. The two parties viewed the question as to political effects from different standpoints also. The Conservative was suspicious of too great a degree of commercial intimacy, and a dependence to any considerable extent upon American manufacturing centres for supplies, fearing the growth of annexation sentiments as an outcome of commercial and business intimacy. The Liberal statesman, on the contrary, dismissed all fears of this character and pronounced them groundless and absurd. The object to be aimed at, in their belief, was to secure material prosperity for Canada, and a condition of commercial relations between two great Anglo-Saxon states where nature would be left as far as possible to assert its sway. The annexation question, they averred, might safely be left to take care of itself, and the opinion was entertained that increased prosperity and wealth would not necessarily have a tendency to make the Canadian discontented with his political institutions.

After eighteen years in opposition, the Liberal party came into power in 1896. It had gone through the general election contest of 1891, pledged to make every effort compatible with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests and the dignity of Canada, to obtain more extended trade relations with the United States. The same pledge was a feature in its appeal to the electors of Canada in 1896, and no effort since the advent of the party to office, something over two years ago, has been spared to make good its promises to the people. Leading members of the Liberal party have visited Washington seeking in a proper and legitimate manner to pave the way to the opening of negotiations. Their success, while the Dingley bill was under consideration, was not at all flattering. The reciprocity clause of that bill, contrary to the representations and application of leading Canadians, failed to provide for the consideration of reciprocal trade relations in natural products. The refusal thus to lay the foundation for the consideration of a treaty under the provisions of the Dingley bill was accepted as an indication that the United States Government would not be prepared to entertain proposals for a broad reciprocal trade arrangement. These indications were received with very great regret by the Liberal leaders of Canada.

Last autumn Sir Wilfrid Laurier visited Washington. Mr. Foster proposed, on behalf of the United States, that the Canadian Government should at once abandon pelagic sealing, and leave the other questions at issue between the two countries to be settled at a later date. Sir Wilfrid Laurier very properly responded that the Government of Canada was ready and anxious to enter at a moment's notice upon the consideration of all questions pending between the two countries; that its commission would be appointed, and the matter proceeded with whenever the United States was ready, but that he did not deem it advisable in the interests of Canada to allow one of the numerous matters pending between the two countries, in which the United States took the deepest and most immediate interest, to be selected for concession by Canada, as this course might result in an indefinite postponement of the consideration of questions in which Canada herself took perhaps deeper interest than did the Government of the United States. The matter thus dropped for the time being, with the express declaration from the head of the Canadian Government that Canada stood ready to enter upon the consideration of these questions at any time, and was anxious to do so.

After a delay, longer no doubt than would have intervened but for the all engrossing conflict with Spain, the Government of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States has decided to become a party to the appointment of a Joint High Commission. Promptly following this decision, Her Majesty has appointed the British and Canadian members of this commission, who are Lord Herschell, late Lord Chancellor of Great Britain; Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of the Dominion; Sir Richard J. Cartwright, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce; Sir L. H. Davies, Canadian Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and John Charlton, M. P. The *personnel* of this commission can hardly fail to be satisfactory to all who desire to see friendly relations between the two countries promoted. Its Canadian members are veterans in their connection with Canadian public affairs. The Premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, entered Parliament in 1874, and has served continuously in that capacity since that time. Sir Richard J. Cartwright has been connected with Parliamentary and political affairs in Canada since 1863. He was returned to the House of Commons in 1867, and has been a member of that body since that date, except for a period of three years. Mr. John Charlton entered Parliament in 1872, and has been a member continuously since that date. Sir Louis H. Davies entered Parliament in 1882. All of these gentlemen throughout their long Parliamentary careers have been outspoken in their expression of a desire to promote friendly relations between Great Britain and the United States. Each one of them has the utmost respect for the great Republic. All of them have made a study of its institutions; are conversant with its history, with its enormous resources, and with its almost illimitable latent power. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Premier, may be said to be an ardent admirer of the United States. His *beau ideal,* as a statesman and a great leader, is Abraham Lincoln. Not the slightest tinge of prejudice or race animosity influences him in his feelings toward the great Republic. Almost as much can be said with regard to all the other members of the Canadian Commission, whose utterances in favor of cordial relations and friendly intercourse have earned for them in the past a storm of obloquy from the ultra-loyal Conservative element of Canada, by whom they have often been branded as disloyal men and annexationists—most unjust charges, as their public utterances could never have been construed as advocating more than closer union, better feeling, and common purposes in dealing with all affairs involving the interests of the Anglo-Saxon race.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Herschell, the English member of the commission, will look after imperial interests, and will, of course, be the most important figure upon the commission. His sympathies may be relied upon to be thoroughly with any proposal that looks to Anglo-Saxon unity and cordial relations between the two great representatives of Anglo-Saxon power. It goes without saying that the Canadian members of this commission will deal with all the questions submitted to them in a broad-minded, friendly spirit. If its members are met in the same spirit by the American members of the commission, the outcome of their deliberations can scarcely fail to be one that will confer a blessing upon the Anglo-Saxon race, and through them upon humanity.

The questions to be submitted will be in the order of their importance; the trade relations between the two countries, including bonding regulations; the fishery question, in its application not only to the seaboard fisheries, but to regulations for the control of the fisheries on the great inland lakes; the settlement of the Alaskan boundary question; and the question of pelagic sealing, and regulations generally bearing upon the sealing question. All of these questions are of prime importance.

Upon the settlement of the trade question hinges probably more important consequences as to the future of the two countries than upon any of the others named. The volume of trade between Canada and the United States, even under the restrictive conditions that at present exist, is very large, and exceeds the total trade of Canada with Great Britain. The total imports of Canada for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, amounted to $119,218,609. The total exports of the country for the same year amounted to $137,950,253. The balance of trade in favor of Canada was $18,731,644.

The following table will illustrate the comparative volume and importance of this trade with the United States, and with Great Britain, and all other countries. In this table the exports are restricted to the products of Canada, and the imports to importations for consumption in Canada. The table is as follows:

CANADA.

Abstract of Trade Returns, 1897.

Total imports for consumption	**$111,294,021**
Total exports, produce of Canada	**123,959,838**
Balance of trade in favor of Canada	**22,665,817**
Total imports for consumption on free list	**45,073,256**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Total dutiable imports for consumption		$66,220,765
Total amount of duty collected		19,891,997
Rate of duty on total import for consumption	17.87	
Rate of duty on total dutiable import for consumption	30	
Total imports from the United States for consumption		61,649,041
Portion free of duty		31,166,532
Portion dutiable		30,482,509
Total exports to United States, produce of Canada		43,991,485
Balance of trade in favor of United States		17,657,556
Amount of duty collected upon United States imports		8,147,075
Rate of duty on total amount of imports from the United States for consumption	13.215	
Rate of duty on dutiable portion of imports for consumption from the United States	26.72	
Total imports from Great Britain for consumption		29,412,188
Portion free of duty		9,194,766
Portion dutiable		20,217,422
Total exports to Great Britain, produce of Canada		69,533,852
Balance of trade against Great Britain		40,121,664
Amount of duty collected upon imports from Great Britain		6,205,367
Rate of duty on total amount of imports for consumption from Great Britain	21.09	
Rate of duty on dutiable portion of imports for consumption from Great Britain	30.69	
Total imports for consumption from all countries other than United States and Great Britain		20,232,792
Portion of the same free of duty		4,711,958
Portion of the same dutiable		15,520,834
Total exports the produce of Canada to all countries other than Great Britain and the United States		10,434,501
Balance of trade against Canada		9,798,291
Duty collected upon above imports		5,539,555
Rate of duty upon total imports from such countries for consumption	27.37	
Rate of duty upon dutiable portion of imports from such countries for consumption	29.25	

More than one-half of the total imports of Canada for consumption for 1897 were from the United States. The free list was 50½ per cent. of the total amount. Against this free list of over $31,000,000 Canada received under the Dingley bill in the last fiscal year the privilege of free entry for its products into the markets of the United States to the extent of not more than $8,000,000. The importance of the Canadian market to United States manufacturers is yearly increasing. The imports of manufactures last year from the United States exceeded $30,000,000 in amount, over $5,000,000 of which was upon the free list. The arguments to be presented in favor of more extended commercial intercourse will, therefore, be well founded ones.

The bonding regulations of the two countries will, no doubt, if the labors of the commission reach a successful issue, be placed upon a permanent and satisfactory basis. The bonding privileges at present enjoyed by each country over the routes and lines of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transit of the other are of great mutual advantage, and to terminate these privileges would cause widespread business paralysis and disaster in both countries. A considerable proportion of the exports of Canada now pass over American railway lines in bond, and are exported from American seaports. The bulk of the Manitoba wheat crop is trans-shipped from railway to vessel at Fort William, Lake Superior, freighted to Buffalo, and shipped in bond from that port to New York by rail or canal. This trade is in its infancy, and will assume vast proportions in the near future. The products of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec find their winter outlet to European markets largely over American lines, and from the ports of Portland, Boston and New York. The return trade in winter, and to a considerable extent in summer, in imports from Europe to America follows the same route. Lumber and other forest products pass in large quantities through Lake Champlain, and by canal and the Hudson River to New York in bond, destined for the West Indian and South American markets. These, and other lines of export and import transit in bond, give a great volume of profitable business to American railways and canals and to American seaports. Canadian railway lines and the Canadian canals in many ways serve the purposes and promote the interests of the American producer, consumer and middleman. The Grand Trunk, Michigan Central, and Wabash lines cross the territory of Ontario, and by doing so secure the most direct line from Chicago to New England and New York. The flouring mills of Minneapolis, and the producers of Minnesota and Northern Wisconsin have their most direct and economical route to the New England cities over the Canadian Pacific line *via* Sault Ste. Marie. The Canadian railways are competitors with American lines for a large amount of business between American points, and this competition prevents combinations from securing exorbitant rates. Its influence may not be popular with American railway managers, but it promotes the interests of the American producer and consumer. The Welland and St. Lawrence canals are open and largely used in the transportation of grain, flour, and other commodities from the Western States to New England and New York. Over all of these Canadian rail and water routes, bonding privileges for live stock and all kinds of products and merchandise in transit are granted under regulations of the greatest liberality.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Occasionally a voice is heard in one of the Houses of Congress demanding the abrogation of bonding privileges between Canada and the United States, not so much because any argument can be adduced against the practical operation of an international system of interchange of transportation facilities that weaves into one harmonious web a multitude of industries and confers benefits upon millions of people on both sides of the boundary line, while at the same moment serving most potently to fuse the interests and promote the homogeneity of two kindred peoples, but because it is proposed to punish the Canadian bad boy for offences—real or supposed—by calling down upon his head the share of the consequences of an act of commercial war that would fall to his lot. At rarer intervals a similar voice has been heard in the Canadian Parliament, coming from some loyal Rip Van Winkle who has slept with his prejudices while the column of progress was marching on, and who demands that Canada shall be self-sustaining and self-contained, and shall seek the sea only over her own lines of communication. The commission can render no greater service to its constituent interests than to take such action as will render these jingo demands ghostly voices in the wilderness of the past which an era of justice and good will repudiates.

The fishery question in all its bearings will be one of very great importance, and the adjustment of the difficulties that have grown up under the laws and regulations based upon the Treaty of 1818 will have a very powerful influence upon the inauguration of better relations. Complaint has arisen as to the character of privileges extended to American fishermen, on the ground that they fall far short of the ordinary commercial comity of the latter quarter of the nineteenth century as accorded one to another by enlightened maritime states. Whatever privileges may have been denied under the provisions of legislation warranted by the conditions of the treaty, as to shelter, making repairs, purchase of bait and supplies, and use of Canadian railways for transport of catch in bond, will form a subject of friendly consideration. The regulations on the great interior lakes lying upon the border of the two countries require to be made uniform. At the present time, stringent provisions are in force upon the Canadian side for the protection of these fisheries, while upon the American side they are being depleted by reckless disregard of the conditions necessary for their preservation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The settlement of the Alaskan boundary question should have received earlier attention, and has now become a matter of unexpected importance, owing to the gold discoveries of the Klondike region and other sections of the upper Yukon Valley within the limits of Canada. The delimitation of the boundary of the narrow strip of land along the coast from Mount St. Elias southward, which intervenes between Canadian territory and the waters of the Pacific, will be a matter presenting some difficulty, as the question as to the southerly limit of this coast barrier and as to what constitutes the coast line, and whether it shall follow deep and narrow indentations which are canals or estuaries, will naturally lead to divergence of opinion. It is sincerely to be hoped that this question will be settled in a satisfactory manner.

The question of pelagic sealing also awaits consideration, and the natural desire of the United States to preserve the seal herds of the Pribyloff Islands, and to put an end to the wasteful and cruel destruction of seals at sea by pelagic sealing, will naturally command careful attention and considerate action.

Other questions may possibly present themselves for the consideration of the commission; among them possibly the problem of securing a better outlet for the region adjacent to the great lakes by a deep water channel to tide water. Preliminary consideration looking to a final adjustment of this most important question might properly engage attention.

The broad field to be covered by the investigations and action of this Joint International Commission make the high importance of its labors clearly apparent. Upon its wisdom, forbearance, spirit of mutual concession and friendliness of purpose, will depend the question as to whether the results will be thoroughly satisfactory, or the reverse. The dawning of an era of better feeling between the two great Anglo-Saxon commonwealths intensifies the importance of its action, and the hope of every friend of Anglo-Saxon interests, and of human progress, will naturally be for a successful consummation of its mission, and the securing of a settlement which will remove from the storm centre of irritation and friction arising between the two Anglo-Saxon families, all clashing interests and divergent purposes that have hitherto proved a prolific source of annoyance and bad feeling.

A CANADIAN LIBERAL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES SENATE: ITS PRIVILEGES, POWERS AND FUNCTIONS, ITS RULES AND METHODS OF DOING BUSINESS.

BY THE HON. W. A. PEFFER, LATE U. S. SENATOR FOR KANSAS.

ON the fourth day of March, 1789, the day named in the Constitution for the assembling of Congress, only eight Senators appeared and they adjourned from day to day and from time to time until the sixth day of April next following, when a quorum was present and eleven States were represented. North Carolina and Rhode Island had not yet ratified the Constitution. A roll-call disclosed the presence of the following-named Senators: From New Hampshire, John Langdon and Paine Wingate; from Massachusetts, Caleb Strong and Tristram Dalton; from Connecticut, Oliver Elsworth and William S. Johnson; from New York, Rufus King and Philip Schuyler; from New Jersey, William Paterson and Jonathan Elmer; from Pennsylvania, William Maclay and Robert Morris; from Delaware, Richard Bassett and George Read; from Maryland, Charles Carroll and John Henry; from Virginia, Richard Henry Lee and William Grayson; from South Carolina, Ralph Izard and Pierce Butler; from Georgia, William Few and James Gunn. One-half of them had been members of the convention which framed the Constitution and seventeen of them had taken part in the work of the Continental Congress. Eleven were lawyers, and among the others the record shows one merchant, one man of business, one physician and one farmer.

Following the practice of the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, the Senate sat with closed doors.*

* This practice was continued until the beginning of the session that commenced December, 1794. As early as April 29, 1790, efforts were b gun to open the doors when the Senate was in legislative session, but without success (except during the discussion of the Gallatin contested election case), until on the 20th day of February, 1794, when a resolution passed to open the doors at the beginning of the next session.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By agreement the Senators arranged themselves in a semi-circle in front of the presiding officer, beginning on the right with New Hampshire and ending on the left with Georgia. The President-elect of the United States not yet having appeared and taken the oath of office, the Senate devoted a good deal of time to the preparation of rules for the proper transaction of business. The manner of communication between the two Houses was referred to a select committee on the 16th of April, and a week later the committee reported that they had conferred with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives and they had agreed to report the following rule:

"When a bill or other message shall be sent from the Senate to the House of Representatives it shall be carried by the Secretary, who shall make one obeisance to the Chair on entering the door of the House of Representatives, and another on delivering it at the table into the hands of the Speaker. After he shall have delivered it, he shall make an obeisance to the Speaker and repeat it as he retires from the House.

"When a bill shall be sent up by the House of Representatives to the Senate it shall be carried by two members, who, at the bar of the Senate, shall make their obeisance to the President, and thence, advancing to the Chair, make a second obeisance, and deliver it into the hands of the President. After having delivered the bill they shall make their obeisance to the President, and repeat it as they retire from the bar."

This report was agreed to and then reconsidered. The subject was again committed and recommitted and on May second it was "agreed that until a permanent mode of communication shall be adopted between the Senate and House of Representatives, the Senate will receive messages by the Clerk of the House, if the House shall think proper to send him—and papers sent from the House shall be delivered to the Secretary at the bar of the Senate, and by him conveyed to the President."

The committee's report was never adopted. The early practice was continued. When the Clerk of the House appears inside the door of the Senate chamber with a message, the fact is announced by the Doorkeeper thus: "Message from the House of Representatives," when business is temporarily suspended, and the President recognizing "Mr. Clerk," that officer, bowing and addressing the Chair, says: "I am directed to inform the Senate that the House has passed ——," a certain bill or resolution, or whatever may be the nature of the information to be communicated. Having thus spoken, he delivers the paper, or papers, to the Doorkeeper and politely retires. The document is then de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

livered to the Secretary or his Chief Clerk, and business is resumed.

The same simple proceeding is had when the President's Private Secretary appears with a message from the Executive. On being announced and recognized by the chair, he says: "I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver a message in writing," or "to announce his approval" of a certain bill, or whatever may have been the President's action on a particular matter.

The Senate communicates with the President through its Secretary or by a special committee of its members.

The next subject involving questions of official etiquette which the Senate at the beginning had to determine was: "What style or title it will be proper to annex to the offices of President and Vice-President," and a committee was appointed to consider the matter. The subject was discussed frequently from April 23d until May 14th, and many different titles were suggested, as "His Highness," "His Excellency," etc. The committee finally reported in favor of "His Highness, the President of the United States of America and Protector of the Rights of the Same." But the House of Representatives favored the simple language of the Constitution, "The President of the United States," and that has been the form of address ever since.

At first, executive communications were delivered to the Senate by Cabinet officers, and when the President wished to communicate in person with the Senate, he informed that body when he would appear, as he did on several occasions and conferred with the Senate in respect to treaties and appointments. This practice did not long continue, however. The President's Private Secretary soon came to be the bearer of his messages, and he has performed that service ever since, though the rule providing for the reception of the President, when he calls on the Senate officially, is still preserved and is now in force.

The first message of President Washington was delivered by himself orally in an address before both Houses, and each House, following the custom of the British Parliament, prepared and delivered an "answer" to the address.

The first code of rules adopted for the government of the Senate was severely disciplinarian. One of them required that "inviolable secrecy shall be observed with respect to all matters

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transacted in the Senate while the doors are shut, or as often as the same is enjoined from the Chair." The last one provided that:

"These rules shall be engrossed on parchment and hung up in some conspicuous part of the Senate Chamber. And every Senator who shall neglect attendance during a session, absent himself without leave, or withdraw for more than a quarter of an hour without permission after a quorum is formed, shall be guilty of disorderly behavior, and his name, together with the nature of the transgression, shall be written on a slip of paper and annexed to the bottom of the rules, there to remain until the Senate, on his application or otherwise, shall take order on the same."

Attention, order and manly bearing, with resulting ease and dignity in speech, were so highly prized by these our first Senators, that seven of their rules of procedure related to personal deportment of members of the body during session hours.

Looking back from this distance, it seems strange that such rigid rules were deemed necessary among gentlemen so punctilious as they. Congress met in Philadelphia the next year and a newspaper writer of that city thus described the Senate's decorum:

"Among the Senators is observed constantly during the debates the most delightful silence, the most beautiful order, gravity, and personal dignity of manner. They all appear every morning full-powdered and dressed in the richest material. The very atmosphere of the Chamber seems to inspire wisdom, mildness and condescension. Should any of the Senators so far forget for a moment as to be the cause of a protracted whisper while another was addressing the Vice-President, three gentle raps with his silver pencil-case by Mr. Adams immediately restored everything to repose and the most respectful attention."

These rules were amended and modified from time to time as occasion and experience suggested, and in 1806 a new code was adopted, retaining such of the old as had proven to be suitable for the work of the Senate. The revision included forty rules, the exact number now in force. The most important change from the old code was the omission of the "previous question." Under the operation of that rule a majority of a quorum could at any time stop a debate. The rule was not popular. Only four times in sixteen years had it been invoked, and in one of the instances it was ruled out of order because the matter pending was a preamble and not a substantive proposition.

There have been several attempts to restore the rule, in substance at least, notably in 1841 by Henry Clay, in 1850 by Stephen A. Douglas, in 1870 by Hannibal Hamlin and Henry Wilson; and the subject has been brought to the attention of the Senate occa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sionally since, when some measure was vigorously urged and persistently opposed, as in the case of the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of the silver law, at the extraordinary session in 1893.

The effect of dropping the previous question has been to broaden the scope of debate and this sometimes provokes unfavorable criticism outside the chamber as well as inside; but it is questionable whether it ever will be, or ought to be, restored.

Without the spur of the previous question the Senate has become more patient and conservative than it was in the beginning. It is nowhere recorded in the proceedings of the Senate, since the century began, that any member of the body was denied the privilege of speaking to any important matter pending. A vote on the main question can be reached only by unanimous consent, and that is never given on any great question until every Senator who desires to speak upon it has had an opportunity to be heard. If he does not conclude to-day he may proceed to-morrow and continue the next day.

And from this courtesy among Senators it sometimes happens that a small matter is the occasion of long, able and powerful debate on questions in no way related to the pending proposition. No harm has come from this. On the contrary, it has been instructive and helpful. Every great discussion in the Senate has served to enlarge the horizon of liberty and to strengthen the foundations of the Republic. As an example take this: In January, 1830, Mr. Foote, a Senator from Connecticut offered a resolution instructing the committee on public lands to inquire and report certain facts relating to the public domain.

Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, speaking to the resolution, criticised the Eastern people, because, as he believed, they were disposed to prevent emigration to the Western States and Territories, and would be aided in their efforts by stopping sales of the public lands there. This brought Daniel Webster to the defence of New England, and in his answer to Mr. Benton he alleged that the author of the Ordinance of 1787, which opened a vast region of the West to settlement and dedicated the Northwest Territory of freedom, was an Eastern man. Discussing the wisdom of that measure, he referred to the prevailing customs in the South, and made comparisons distasteful to Senators from the slave-holding States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert Y. Hayne, of South Carolina, defended his people and arraigned those of the East in a long and able speech.

Mr. Hayne's speech was delivered on the 21st day of January. On the 26th, Mr. Webster replied in an argument which has become historic.

Inspired by this battle of giants, Mr. Calhoun, who was then Vice-President, resigned that position that he might enter the Senate as a member, and in July next following he delivered a speech discussing not anything then before the body, but the argument delivered by Mr. Webster six months before.

Following this, at the next session of Congress, came the famous free trade report of the Committee on Ways and Means, followed by the nullification proceedings of '32 and the compromise tariff act of '33, and eighteen years afterward by the compromise measures of 1850, and in 1852 by the adoption of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798-99, as the creed of the Democratic party, supplemented by the slaveholders' rebellion in 1861—all bearing close and direct relation to what was said in the Senate in the discussion following the introduction of Mr. Foot's modest resolution proposing to inquire whether it would not be wise to temporarily limit the sale of public lands.

Speeches of Senators on important subjects are, in most cases, prepared carefully in advance, reduced to writing and read by the author from manuscript. It is very seldom that a Senator proceeds in a great effort without copious notes, if his speech is not in writing or print before him.

In order to maintain the relative power of parties in the Senate and in order that no Senator need "lose his vote," a custom prevails by which members of opposing parties form themselves into "pairs," and if one of a "pair" is absent when a vote is taken, the other does not vote.

All confidential communications from the President of the United States are considered in secret executive sessions, and all treaties laid before the Senate, and all remarks, votes and proceedings thereon are kept secret, under the thirty-sixth rule. The fourth clause of this rule provides that "any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The injunction of secrecy may be removed, in any given case, by a resolution of the Senate. This is not often done, however, but newspaper reporters have become so expert in their profession that they publish fairly accurate statements of what was said and done in executive sessions of the Senate.

In all cases except treason, felony and breach of the peace, Senators are privileged from arrest during their attendance at the sessions of the Senate, and in going to and returning from the same, and for "any speech or debate" in the Senate they "shall not be questioned in any other place."

From the beginning it has been the custom to allow newspapers to be paid for out of the "contingent fund," which is a fund to be applied to special uses under the exclusive control of the Senate—as stationery, select committee expenses, etc. At first the number of papers which Senators allowed themselves was limited to three each. Stationery was used without limit until 1868, when the amount allowed to each Senator was fixed at $125 a session for newspapers and stationery. It was subsequently changed to $125 a year, and that is the rule now. If more than that amount is drawn the difference is paid in cash by the Senator; if less is drawn he receives the difference in money.

Senators are privileged to send through the mails, free of charge, any public document printed by order of Congress and official letters to any officer of the Government.

Each Senator is entitled to one copy of every Government publication, and he may have it bound in half morocco or material no more expensive.

No person is admitted to the floor of the Senate Chamber while the body is in session or during the fifteen minutes immediately preceding the hour of meeting, except the following: The President of the United States and his Private Secretary, the President and Vice-President elect, ex-Presidents and ex-Vice-Presidents, Judges of the Supreme Court, ex-Senators and Senators-elect, the officers and employees of the Senate in the discharge of their official duties, ex-Secretaries and ex-Sergeants-at-arms of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, and members-elect, ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives, the Sergeant-at-arms and his chief deputy and the Clerk of the House and his deputy, heads of the Executive Departments, Ambassadors and Ministers of the United States, Governors of States and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Territories, the General commanding the army, the Senior Admiral of the navy on the active list, members of National Legislatures of foreign countries, Judges of the Court of Claims, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Librarian of Congress and the Assistant Librarian in charge of the Law Library, the Architect of the Capitol, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, Clerks to Senate Committees and Clerks to Senators, when in actual discharge of their official duties.

The Senate meets, usually, at 12 o'clock, noon. After prayer by the Chaplain and the reading of the journal of the last preceding day's proceedings, the first thing in order is the presentation of petitions and memorials; then follow in their order reports of standing and select committees, introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and concurrent and other resolutions.

The first two hours of the session is known as "the morning hour," during which all preliminary proceedings are had, such as debates on Senate resolutions, first and second readings of bills, motions for reference, consideration of matters coming over from a previous day, etc. At 2 o'clock the presiding officer lays before the Senate the "unfinished business," if there be any, and if not, the calendar is in order.

In addition to the usual prerogatives of parliamentary bodies, the Senate enjoys certain privileges and exercises certain functions and powers which are conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States. It may originate legislation on any subject over which Congress has jurisdiction, except revenue.

It may concur in, amend or reject any bill or resolution sent to it by the House of Representatives; it may adjourn for any length of time not exceeding three days, without the consent of the other House, but must not adjourn to any place other than that "in which the two Houses shall be sitting." The Senate is the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members, and it chooses its own officers and makes its own rules. Though a legislative body, it is charged with executive functions in respect to treaties and appointments to office. The President has power to make treaties and appoint officers, but that power has coupled with it—"by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." The President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint" Ambassadors, other public ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not otherwise provided for in the Constitution, and which shall be established by law. A simple majority of a quorum may advise and consent to an appointment, but two-thirds of the Senators present are required to ratify a treaty.

Under the operation of the twelfth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, taking effect 25th September, 1804, the Senate is charged with the duty of choosing the Vice-President in case none of the persons voted for for that office has received a majority of the votes cast; and, when sitting for this purpose, two-thirds of the whole number of Senators must be present, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. The only instance of the Senate's performing this function was in the case of Richard M. Johnson in 1837.

The Senate has power to compel the attendance of absent members, to inflict punishment for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two-thirds may expel a member for any cause deemed sufficient.

The power of the Senate to punish persons not members of the body, for contempt, defamation, libel, etc., has never been clearly and fully defined. None of the cases acted upon has settled any important questions in that direction. Though in some respects fashioned after the model of the Upper House of the British Parliament, the Senate has no judicial power, except in cases of impeachment. Its powers of punishment and expulsion are applicable only to its own members, and were granted for its own protection. The Duane case is in point. William Duane, of Philadelphia, on the 19th day of February, 1800, published in the *General Advertiser, or Aurora*, a newspaper of that city, a copy of a bill "prescribing the mode of deciding disputed elections of President and Vice-President of the United States," together with editorial comments thereon, reflecting on the action of the Senate and of certain Senators, naming them, in respect to the alleged passage of the bill, which matter was declared by the Senate to be "false, defamatory, scandalous and malicious, tending to defame the Senate," and Mr. Duane was summoned to appear at the bar of the Senate, on a day named, "at which time he will have opportunity to make any proper defense for his conduct," etc. He did appear and asked for the assistance of counsel. The request was granted, but on terms

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he regarded as in restraint of his constitutional rights, and he refused to further appear or answer.

On March 27th following, the Senate held that Duane was in contempt and the Sergeant-at-arms was directed to take him into custody and hold him subject to further order of the Senate. But Congress being about to adjourn, and the Senate not claiming power to hold a prisoner beyond the session, the President of the United States was requested by a resolution of the Senate, May 14, 1800, to instruct the proper officer to institute an action against Duane for the defamatory publication. An action was begun, he submitted his case to the court and was sentenced to thirty days' imprisonment and to pay the costs of prosecution.

In several instances happening since Duane's case was disposed of, newspaper reporters have been deprived of the privileges of the floor or gallery, as the case may be, because of publishing matter disrespectful to the Senate or its members.

As to the power of the Senate to compel witnesses to appear and testify, whatever may be its extent, it is not unlimited. The existence of this power was taken for granted until 1857, when the question was raised by the refusal of a witness to testify before a committee of the House of Representatives, with the result that, while the witness was in custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, January 21st, 1857, the committee before whom he was subpoenaed to testify, reported to the House a bill, which became a law three days afterward, providing for trial and punishment of contumacious witnesses before committees of either House of Congress. The law was changed somewhat by act of January 24th, 1862. The present statutory provisions relating to this subject are found in Sections 101 to 104 inclusive, and Section 859, of the Revised Statutes of 1878. By Section 102, refusal to testify is declared to be a misdemeanor, and Section 104 provides that: "Whenever a witness summoned as mentioned in Section 102 fails to testify, and the facts are reported to either House, the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, as the case may be, shall certify the fact under the seal of the Senate or the House to the District Attorney for the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the Grand Jury for their action."

It was under these provisions that the witnesses in the Sugar Trust scandal investigation in 1894 were indicted and tried.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There have been but few cases of disorder among Senators in the Senate Chamber of a character requiring official action. Senators rarely violate a rule of order willfully, and they are usually prompt to make proper explanations and apologies for any breaches of privilege happening among them in debate.

A resolution to expel Benjamin Tappan, a Senator from Ohio, was submitted May 10th, 1844. That Senator, in violation of the rule of secrecy, had delivered to a newspaper reporter for publication a copy of the Texas annexation treaty. The resolution was afterward modified so as to declare that Mr. Tappan "has been guilty of a flagrant violation of the rules of the Senate and disregard of its authority." After the resolution was adopted, it was further resolved, "That in consideration of the acknowledgments and apology tendered by the said Benjamin Tappan for his said offense, no further censure be inflicted on him."

In the case of Senators Benton, of Missouri, and Foote, of Mississippi, a special committee was appointed to report. On several occasions prior to April 17th, 1850, these two Senators "had some sharp personal altercations in the Senate. On that date, while Mr. Foote was speaking in reply to Mr. Benton, the latter started from his seat and moved toward Mr. Foote. Mr. Foote left his seat and took a stand in front of the Secretary's table, at the same time drawing and cocking a revolver. Mr. Benton was led back to his seat by Senators in the midst of great confusion, and Mr. Foote was induced to surrender the pistol."

The committee reported that the whole scene was most discreditable to the Senate, but recommended no action, expressing the hope that their condemnation of the affair would be "a sufficient rebuke and a warning not unheeded in future."

The attack on Charles Sumner occurred in the Senate Chamber after the body had adjourned, and the offending party was not a member of the Senate.

The Senate has exercised its power of expulsion five times. William Blount, a Senator from Tennessee, was expelled July 8th, 1797, for complicity in a scheme to transfer New Orleans and adjacent territory from Spain to Great Britain. John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, was expelled December 4th, 1861, for participation in the rebellion. Trusten Polk and Waldo P. Johnson, Senators from Missouri, were expelled January 10th, 1862,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for aiding and abetting the rebellion. Jesse D. Bright, of Indiana, was expelled on the 5th day of February, 1862, for disloyalty in writing a letter to Jefferson Davis introducing a man who wanted "to dispose of what he regards a great improvement in firearms."

In connection with these expulsions for disloyalty it may be stated that the Senators from Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas and Virginia voluntarily retired between the months of November, 1860, and July, 1861. A. O. P. Nicholson of Tennessee retired March 3d, 1861.

Of the Senators in office May 1st, 1898, twenty-one served in the Confederate army.

The Senate has the "sole power to try all impeachments." The President, Vice-President and all civil officers of the United States are impeachable for "treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors," and on conviction for any of these offenses they shall be removed from office; but no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present. There is no appeal from the judgment, and the President, though authorized by the Constitution "to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States," is specially prohibited from interfering in cases of impeachment. They are excepted.

"Judgment, in case of impeachment, shall not extend further than to removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment according to law."

The Senate is not called upon to determine generally who are "civil officers of the United States;" it is sufficient, in each case as it is presented, to inquire whether the party impeached is included in that class. Articles impeaching William Blount were presented to the Senate for trial in 1797. Mr. Blount, being a member of the Senate, pleaded that he was not a "civil officer of the United States," and on that ground he objected to the jurisdiction of the Senate. On argument, his plea was held good and the impeachment proceedings were dismissed, but on the evidence against him he was expelled from the Senate.

There have been seven cases of impeachment prosecuted before the Senate. (1.) The above-mentioned William Blount, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator from Tennessee, for violating the neutrality laws of the United States, 1797. (2.) John Pickering, District Judge, New Hampshire, for having appeared on the bench in a state of intoxication, 1803. (3.) Samuel Chase, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, for that "* * * disregarding the duties and dignity of his judicial character, did, at the Circuit Court for the District of Maryland, held at Baltimore in the month of May, 1803, pervert his official right and duty to address the Grand Jury * * * for the purpose of delivering to the said Grand Jury an intemperate and inflammatory harangue," etc. (4.) James Peck, District Judge, Missouri, for "high misdemeanors in office," 1826-31. (5.) West W. Humphreys, District Judge, Tennessee, for advocating the right of secession in a public speech, 1861. (6.) Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, for "high crimes and misdemeanors," 1868. (7.) William W. Belknap, Secretary of War, for "high misdemeanor in office," 1876-77.

When the Senate tries a case of impeachment, each Senator takes an oath in the following form:

> "I solemnly swear (or affirm, as the case may be) that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of —— ——, now pending, I will do impartial justice according to the constitution and laws. So help me God."

The Senate long ago prepared and adopted a code of rules to govern in the body when sitting on impeachment trials, and in the case of President Johnson, on advice of the Chief Justice, the Senate's impeachment code of (25) rules was formally adopted by the body sitting for the trial of the particular case.

The House of Representatives has the sole power of impeachment. When charges of an impeachable character are preferred in the House against the President, Vice-President, or any civil officer of the United States, a special committee is usually appointed to investigate and report the probable facts, and the Judiciary Committee consider and report whether, on the facts stated, an impeachable offense has been committed and whether the person charged is probably guilty. If the report is affirmative, a committee of "Managers" is appointed by ballot to prepare articles of impeachment and to conduct the prosecution before the Senate. The Managers, on the part of the House in the President's case, were John A. Bingham, of Ohio; George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts; James F. Wilson, of Iowa; John

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A. Logan, of Illinois; Thomas Williams, of Pennsylvania; Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts; Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania.*

The preliminary proceedings in impeachment cases are formal and tedious. When all things are ready the members of the House, before proceeding to the Senate, resolve themselves into a "Committee of the Whole House" for the purpose of prosecuting the impeachment and attend in that manner, though none of them but the Managers takes part in the proceedings.

When the President of the United States is on trial, the Chief Justice presides.

The following is a copy of the opening entry on the journal of proceedings of the trial of the impeachment of President Johnson, March 30th, 1868:

"At half past twelve o'clock, P. M , the Chief Justice of the United States entered the Senate Chamber, escorted by Mr. Pomeroy, chairman of the committee heretofore appointed for that purpose.

"THE CHIEF JUSTICE.—'The Sergeant-at-Arms will open the court by proclamation.'

"THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.—'Hear ye! hear ye! hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silence while the Senate of the United States is sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against Andrew Johnson, President of the United States.'

"The President's counsel, Messrs. Stanbery, Curtis, Evarts, and Groesbeck, entered the Chamber and took the seats assigned to them.

"At twelve o'clock and thirty-five minutes, P. M., the Sergeant-at-Arms announced the presence of the managers of the impeachment on the part of the House of Representatives, and they were conducted to the seats assigned to them.

"Immediately afterwards the presence of the members of the House of Representatives was announced, and the members of the Committee of the Whole House, headed by Mr. E. B. Washburn, of Illinois, the chairman of that committee, and accompanied by the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, entered the Senate Chamber and took the seats prepared for them."

The Senate is a school. The world's history is its text book. The record of a single day's proceedings frequently shows a range of work as wide as Christendom. No man well made up can be there long, if he will but listen, without himself becoming wiser and better. His opportunities for usefulness multiply as the new days come to him; his intellectual horizon expands, his view broadens and he grows stronger.

* The President's counsel were: Henry Stanbery, of Kentucky; B. R. Curtis, of Massachusetts; Thomas A. R. Nelson, of Tennessee; William M. Evarts, of New York; William S. Groesbeck, of Ohio; Jeremiah S. Black of Pennsylvania.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is no disparagement to any one who ever was or is now a member of the United States Senate, to say that it is only the few that are really great. The work of the body has resulted from the combined labors of all its members; each is entitled to his full measure of credit. The least among them has had some part in making up the Senate's record. But in all these hundred years and more there have always been some strong men there, men of great intellectual stature, who were seen and heard above the rest, grand characters that stand out among their fellows like peaks in mountain ranges and that we see afar off as we see cliffs and promontories on the shore line of the sea.

The House of Representatives, as the popular branch of the National Legislature, is commonly regarded as being nearer the people and more responsive to the popular will than the Senate is. Be that as it may, the rules of the lower House are and have been many years framed to restrict rather than to enlarge the freedom of speech. In the Senate there is no limit to debate except unanimous consent. The youngest member's objection prevents a vote if he desires to amend or to be heard on the main question. In a speech of great force delivered a few years ago in the Senate by Mr. Hoar, alluding to this subject, he said:

"The freedom of debate in the House of Representatives is gone. What I sometimes think is of more importance, the freedom of amendment, is gone also. * * * It is here only that the freedom of debate is secure. * * * Victories in arms are common to all nations. * * * But the greatest victories of constitutional liberty since the world began are those whose battleground has been the American Senate and whose champions have been the Senators, who, for a hundred years, while they have resisted the popular passions of the hour, have led, represented, guided, obeyed, and made effective the deliberate will of a free people."

W. A. PEFFER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ABDICATION OF MAN.

BY ELIZABETH BISLAND.

In the midst of the excursions and alarums of war and preparation for war a sudden and great silence has fallen upon the everlasting discussion of the relations of the sexes. Before the stern realities of that final and bloody argument of Republics as well as Kings further dissection of the Woman Question has been deferred. The most vociferous of the "unquiet sex" have been regarding respectfully the sudden transformation of the plain, unromantic man who went patiently to business every morning in a cable car, and sat on a stool at a desk, or weighed tea, or measured ribbon, into a hero ready to face violent annihilations before which even her imagination recoils. The grim realisms of life and death have made the realism of such erstwhile burning dramas as The Doll House shrink into the triviality of a drama fit only for wooden puppets. Sudden and violent readjustments of ideas are apt to be brought about when human relations are jarred into their true place by the thunder of cannon. War legitimatizes man's claim to superiority. When the sword is drawn he is forced to again mount that ancient seat of rule from which he has only recently been evicted: or rather from which he has himself stepped down. The democracy of sex at once becomes ridiculous—the old feudal relation reasserts itself.

It is interesting to note that there has not been one feminine voice raised to protest against the situation. The entire sex, as represented in this country, has, as one woman, fallen simply and gladly into the old place of nurse, of binder of wounds, of soother and helpmeet. Not one has claimed the woman's equal right to face villainous saltpetre, or risk dismemberment by harbor mines.

I believe this to be because woman prefers this old relation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I believe that if man were willing she would always maintain it; that it depends upon him whether she returns to it permanently or not. I believe that her modern attitude is not of her own choosing—that man has thrust that attitude upon her. For the oldest of all empires is that of man; no royal house is so ancient as his. The Emperors of Japan are parvenus of the vulgarest modernity in comparison, and the claims of long descent of every sovereign in Europe shrivel into absurdity beside the magnificent antiquity of this potentate. Since the very beginning of things, when our hairy progenitors fought for mastery with the megatherium, and scratched pictorial epics upon his victim's bones, the House of Man has reigned and ruled, descending in an unbroken line from father to son in direct male descent. His legitimacy was always beyond dispute; his divine right to rule was not even questioned, and was buttressed against possible criticism not only by the universal concurrence of all religious and philosophic opinion, but by the joyful loyalty of the whole body of his female subjects. Moses and Zoroaster, St. Paul and Plato all bore witness to his supremacy, and the jury of women brought in a unanimous verdict in his favor without calling for testimony.

Women yet living can recall a day when they forgot their pain for joy that a man-child—heir to that famous line of Kings—was born into the world. They can remember a time when their own greatest claim to consideration rested upon the fact that they were capable of perpetuating the royal race. They recollect a period when even from his cradle the boy was set apart to be served with that special reverence reserved for those whose brows are bound with the sacred circlet of sovereignty—when a particular divinity did hedge even the meanest male; a tenfold essence being shed about all those who were of the tribe of Levi

Why then—since all this is of so recent existence, since man's rule was founded so deep on woman's loyalty—has he been swelling the melancholy ranks of Kings in Exile? For that he has ceased to reign over woman does not require even to be asserted. It is self-evident.

When was this amazing revolution effected? Who led the emeute that thrust man from his throne? It is a revolt without a history; without the record of a single battle. Not even a barricade can be set up to its credit, and yet no more important

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution can be found in the pages of the oldest chronicles. So venerable, so deep-rooted in the eternal verities seemed the authority of man over woman that the female mind, until the present day, never doubted its inevitableness. Indeed, as is the case with all loyal natures, she was jealous for the absolutism of her master, and was quick to repair any such small omissions as he himself might have made in the completeness of his domination. All of her sex were trained from their earliest infancy to strive for but one end—to make themselves pleasing to their rulers. Success in the court of man was the end and aim of their existence, the only path for their ambition, and no other courtiers ever rivaled these in the subtle completeness of their flattery. Man's despotism, of course, like all other tyrannies, was tempered by his weaknesses, but while woman wheedled and flattered and secretly bent him to her projects she did not question his real right to govern.

Here and there through the past there arose a few scattered pioneers in recalcitrance. One of the first to deny the innate supremacy of the male was a woman who herself wore a crown. Elizabeth Tudor had a fashion of laying heavy hands upon her rightful lords whenever they displeased her, and she appears to have rejected the whole theory of feminine subordination. John Knox—strong in the power of the priest, whose sublimated prerogatives man had skillfully retained in his own hands—could and did dominate Mary Stuart even upon the throne, but when he blew from Geneva his "First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Woman," and called all the ages to witness that the rule of a female was an affront to nature, that trenchant lady who held the English sceptre forbade him ever to set foot in her domains.

Elizabeth, however, was a unique personality and had few imitators. The literature of her day abounds with expressions of supreme humility and loyalty from the one sex to the other. Elizabethan poets deigned to play at captivity and subjection to the overwhelming charms of Saccharissa and her sisters, and turned pretty phrases about her cruelty, but this was merely poetic license of expression. All serious, unaffected expression of conviction, such as was to be found in the religious writings of the time, and in the voluminous private correspondence which gives us the most accurate description obtainable of the real actions and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinions of our ancestors, never suggested a doubt of man's natural and inalienable superiority, mental, moral, and physical. So undisturbed was this conviction down almost to our own day, that the heresy of Mary Wollstonecraft gave the severest of shocks to her own generation. So heinous seemed her offense of *lésé-majes* in questioning man's divine right that one of the most famous of her contemporaries did not hesitate to stigmatize her as "a hyena in petticoats."

History gives us but one record of a general outbreak. In the 13th Century the Crusades had so drained Europe of its able-bodied men that the women were forced to apply themselves to the abandoned trades and neglected professions. They shortly became so intoxicated by the sense of their own competency and power that when the weary wearers of the cross returned from the East they were at first delighted to discover that their affairs were prospering almost as well as ever, and then amazed and disgusted to find the women reluctant to yield up to their natural rulers these usurped privileges. Stern measures were necessary to oust them. Severe laws were enacted against the admission of women into the Guilds—the labor organizations which at that period governed all the avenues of industrial advancement; and the doors of the professions were peremptorily slammed in the women's faces. Such episodes as these, however, were detached and accidental. Female treason never dared unrebuked to lift its horrid head until within the present generation.

The emancipated new woman has various methods of accounting for the humbling of this hoary sovereignty. Some find it only a natural concomitant of the general wreck of thrones and monarchical privilege—in other words, that it is but one phase of advancing democracy. By some it is supposed that in this Age of Interrogation man's supremacy, along with all other institutions, has been called upon to produce an adequate reason for being, and having no answer that seems satisfactory, he has been summarily forced to abandon pretensions which rested merely upon use and wont. It is said by some that woman has been examining with coldly unprejudiced eye the claim of man to rule, has been measuring his powers against her own and has not been daunted by the comparison. The more noisy declare that she has stripped him of his royal robe and that, like Louis XIV. minus his high heels and towering peruke, she finds him only of medium

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stature after all; that she has turned the rays of a cynical democracy upon the mystery encompassing his Kingship and refuses to be awed by what she sees there; that it is because of this she begins to usurp his privileges, thrust herself into his professions, shoulder him even from the altar, and brazenly seating herself on the throne beside him she lifts the circlet from his brows to try if it be not a fit for her own head.

The weakness of all such explanations is that they do not take into account the fact that woman is not by nature democratic. Whatever political principles the occasional or exceptional woman may profess, the average woman is in all her predilections intensely aristocratic; is by nature loyal, idealistic, an idolator and a hero worshiper. Strong as the spirit of democracy may be, it could not by itself alone in one generation change the nature of woman. The explanation must lie elsewhere.

In the language of a now famous arraignment—"*J'accuse*" man himself.

No ruler is ever really dethroned by his subjects. No hand but his own ever takes the crown from his head. No agency but his can wash the chrism from his brow. It is his own abdication that drives him from power—abdication of his duties, his obligations, his opportunities. Ceasing to rule, he ceases to reign. When he ceases to lead he wants for followers, and the revolt which casts him from power is only the outward manifestation of his previous abdication of the inward or spiritual grace of kingship. When man ceased to govern, woman was not long in throwing off the sham of subjection that remained.

Like other subjects, woman required of her master two things —*panem et circenses,* bread and circuses. When the industrial changes brought about by the introduction of machinery put an end to the old patriarchal system of home manufactures, man found it less easy to provide for his woman-kind—more especially his collateral woman-kind—and without any very manifest reluctance he turned her out into the world to shift for herself. Here was a shock to her faith and loyalty! The all-powerful male admitted his inability to provide for these sisters, cousins, aunts, and more distant kin who had looked up to him as the fount of existence, and had toiled and fed contentedly under his roof, yielding to him obedience as the natural provider and master. Woman went away sorrowful and—very thoughtful.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This alone was not enough to quite alienate her faith, however, Woman was still, as always, a creature of imagination—dazzled by color, by pomp, by fanfaronade. A creature of romance, adoring the picturesque, yielding her heart to courage, to power, to daring and endurance—all the sterner virtues which she herself lacked. The man of the past was often brutal to her—overbearing always, cruel at times, but he fascinated her by his masterfulness and his splendor. She might go fine, but he would still be the finer bird. When she thought of him she was hypnotized by a memory of gold, a waving of purple, a glitter of steel, a flutter of scarlet. He knew that this admiration of hers for beauty and color was as old as the world. From primordial periods the male has recognized this need of the female. The fish in the sea, the reptile in the dust, the bird in the forest, the wild beast in the jungle are all aware of their mates' passion for gleaming scales, for glowing plumes, for dappled hides and orgulous crests of hair. They know, they have always known, that no king can reign without splendor. Only man, bent solely upon his own comfort and, it would seem, upon the abandonment of his power, deliberately sets himself against this need of the female, which has become imbedded in her nature through every successive step up in the scale of evolution. He alone fatuously prides himself on the dark, bifurcated simplicity of his attire; intended only for warmth and ease and constructed with a calculated avoidance of adornment. To avoid criticism he has set up a theory that a superior sort of masculinity is demonstrated by the dark tint and unbeautiful shape of garments; (as if the fighting man, the soldier—who is nothing if not masculine—were not always a colorful creature;) and chooses to ignore or resent woman's weakness for this same gold-laced combatant, and the silken, picturesque actor.

"*J'accuse*" the man of abandoning his mastership and becoming a bourgeois in appearance and manner through a slothful desire for ease. There can hardly be a question that Louis le Grand's red heels and majestic peruke were uncomfortable and a bore, but his sense of humor and knowledge of men were such that his bed curtains were never untucked until his lion's mane had been passed in to him on the end of a walking stick, and was safely in its place. He could imagine how unimposing the King of Beasts might be in *negligé*. He knew that to be reverenced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one must be imposing. Louis the unfortunate found it far less tedious to abandon stateliness and work wigless and leather-aproned at his locksmith's forge, while his feather-headed queen played at being a dairy-maid at Trianon, forgetting that the populace, which had submitted humbly to the bitter exactions of the man who dazzled them, seeing the bald head and leathern apron would get abruptly up from its knees and say: "What! submit to the pretensions of a locksmith and a dairy-maid—common folk like ourselves—certainly not!" and proceed to carry their sovereign's suggestion of equality to the distressingly logical conclusion to be found at the mouth of the guillotine.

"*J'accuse*" man of carrying further this democracy of sex by adding rigid plainness of behavior to ugliness of appearance, forgetting that a woman, like the child and the savage, love pomp of manner as well as of garment, and that what she does not see she finds it hard to believe. Every wise lover soon learns that it is necessary to reinforce the tenderness of his manner by definite assurances of affection several times in every twenty-four hours. Then, and then only is a woman sure she is loved.

How can she believe man heroic unless he use the appearance and manner of the hero?

Sir Hilary of Agincourt, returning from France, found his lady from home, and he and all his weary men-at-arms sat there—mailed cap-a-pie—throughout the entire night until she returned to welcome them home and receive their homage. What if at other times Sir Hilary may have been something of a brute? —Lady Hilary, flattered by this fine piece of steel clad swagger, would, remembering it, forgive a thousand failures of temper or courtesy.

When El Ahmed held the pass all through the darkness while his women fled across the desert, and his foes feared to come to hand grips with him, not knowing he stood there dead, propped against the spear he had thrust into his mortal wound to hold himself erect—there was no female revolt against the domination of men who were capable of deeds that so fired women's imaginations.

These may, after all, seem to be frivolous accusations—that men do not dress well; do not behave dramatically; but the signification of these seemingly capricious charges lies deeper than may appear. Man has been seized with a democratic ideal, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after applying it to political institutions has attempted to carry it into domestic application. He is relentlessly forcing a democracy of sex upon woman; industrially, mentally, and sentimentally. He refuses to gratify her imagination; he insists upon her development of that logical selfishness which underlies all democracy, and which is foreign to her nature. Now, nature has inexorably laid upon woman a certain share of the work that must be done in the world. In the course of ages humanity adjusted itself to its shared labors by developing the relation of master and defender, of dependent and loyal vassal. Sentiment had adorned it with a thousand graces and robbed the feudal relation of most of its hardships. Mutual responsibilities and mutual duties were cheerfully accepted.

Woman was obliged to perform certain duties, and these could only be made easy and agreeable by sentiment, by unselfishness. Man needed her ministrations as much as she needed his. He realized that sentiment was necessary to her happiness and he accepted the duty of preserving that sentiment of loyalty and admiration for himself which made her hard tasks seem easy when performed for a beloved master. He took upon himself that difficult task of being a hero to a person even more intimate than his valet. He took the trouble to please woman's imagination.

The hard democracy of to-day will take no note of the relation of master and dependent. Each individual has all the rights which do not come violently in contact with other's rights, and has no duties which are not regulated by the law. Unselfishness is not contemplated in its scheme. Every individual has a right to all the goods of life he can get.

Women are beginning to accept these stern theories; beginning to apply the cruel logic of individualism. So far from the power to win his favor being her one hope of advancement or success she does not hesitate to say on occasion that to yield to his affections is likely to hamper her in the race for fame or achievement. So far from giving an heir to his greatness being the highest possibility of her existence, she sometimes complains that such duties are an unfair demand upon her energies, which she wishes to devote exclusively to her own ends.

The universal unpopularity of domestic service proves that the duties of a woman are in themselves neither agreeable nor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interesting. Where is the man in all the world who would exchange even the most laborious of his occupations for his wife's daily existence? The only considerations that can permanently reconcile human beings to unattractive labors is first the sentiment of loyalty—that such labors are performed for one who is loved and admired—and second the fine, noble old habit of submission. These incentives to duty, these helps to happiness, man has taken from woman by weakly shuffling off his mastership.

I accuse man of having willfully cast from him the noblest crown in the world—of having wrongfully abdicated. War has at least this merit that it forces him to drop the vulgar careless ease of the bourgeois and resume for the time at least those bold and vigorous virtues which made him woman's hero and cheerfully accepted master.

ELIZABETH BISLAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ZIONISM.

BY THE REV. DR. H. PEREIRA MENDES.

BEHOLD a beautiful ideal, old as the Bible itself, presented to the world anew. It is Zionism. The word has been coined, and its ready acceptance has made it current.

The passing years have seen the Hebrew's Ghetto razed, and the walls of his Judengasse thrown down. In one country after another the sentences of exile have been revoked in his favor, and the doors of the very legislatures have been opened for him. The ranks of the learned receive him gladly, commerce presents its walks for him to tread, and handicrafts and agricultural pursuits are free for his hands to work at.

No sooner was the cry of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity answered in all lands by those rights being accorded to him, than in France he became a Frenchman of the French; in England, an Englishman of the English; in Germany, a German of the Germans; and, here, he is an American of the Americans.

This is to say, he became a model citizen as soon as citizenship was granted to him. Since that day he has always done as he does to-day. He sheds his blood in the ranks of his country's soldiery; he helps to build that country's commercial prosperity and scientific honor; he pays his full proportion of all taxes, and contributes freely at all times, in all ways, in all emergencies; only he does not contribute his proportion of inmates to prisons and inebriate asylums.

But still he is always a Jew; there is something which keeps him so. His religion, his spiritual pabulum, his ideals, all seem to be different from those of his fellow-citizens.

And, in addition to these, there is a mysterious something which keeps him separate from his neighbors of alien faith.

This something is his peculiar destiny. His destiny is to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a conservative influence upon society for reverence, for recognition of Divine interference in human affairs, and for individual and national progress on these lines.

Religion, Ideals, Destiny. Searched to its core, Zionism will be found to mean just these; the religion which Micah sums up in three words—Justice, Loving-kindness, and Humility; the Bible ideals of Universal Peace, Universal Brotherhood, and Universal Happiness; the destiny to carry all to share with him spiritual aspirations which make for righteousness. The mission of Zionism is the strengthening of Jewish sentiment for good, in order that it may logically be the conservative influence above mentioned. This, then, is the end of Zionism: to found a model government, a model state of society, a model system of education.

Zionism thus assumes many fields of action, the cultivation of which is taken up as occasion demands.

It will be at once perceived that it is as old as the Bible. The fields of action popularly identified with Zionism by its promoters to-day are one and all founded on Bible teachings. Any Zionistic idea not so origined, such as acquisition of Palestine by purchase, is *ipso facto* rejected by Biblo-Zionists.

Let us now take up these subjects *seriatim:*

(I.) A model Government.

A glance at the governments of the world shows serious faults in the greatest.

In Russia, expansion of empire means increase of imperial power, but no increase in the prosperity and intellectuality of the people. In Germany, it does mean increased imperial power, and the prosperity and intellectuality of the people are increasing at the same time. But, by reason of her militarism, she falls short of being an ideal government, as Russia does by her lack of representative government. And both of them fall short by reason of differentiation between religious sects.

In Austria, the monarchy shows a distinct failure due to unfusable elements. No one doubts that when the present Emperor dies the Austrian empire will disintegrate.

Italy shows a beautiful land, once the home of a grandly virile nation, now the home of a nation of diminished glory and diminished strength. The monarchical power seems unable to stave off bankruptcy, or to prevent bread riots, or to wisely administer the nation's military strength

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spain shows a monarchy of which the less said the better and the kinder. Once the greatest among the civilized nations in territorial expanse, she has lost nearly everything. Her cruelty in Cuba and the Philippines has alienated her friends. Her country, once studded with universities to which the young flocked from all parts of Europe for culture, now is the home of dense ignorance and crass bigotry. Monarchy in Spain has permitted decay. It has therefore been a failure.

France shows a republic which has given the death-blow to republicanism in many a heart that would fain be loyal. For if republicanism can hurl justice from her throne, can deprive a citizen of his liberty and of his honor without allowing him to know the evidence against him, can permit its military power to refuse to answer the inquiries in the court of justice, and so demonstrate that militarism is greater than justice; if a republic can be so false to its noble ideas of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity; if a republic can be so lost to honor, that it places the honor of its army officers above the honor of its army, above its own fair name, yes, above the honor of France, no true-hearted man can wish such a republic to stand.

A further proof of the failure of the French Republic is offered by the fact that the vast expansion of French territory does not mean any great commercial advantage, or any increased prosperity, for the French at home. Other nations reap as much advantage from the French colonies as the French themselves, and without the expenditure of life and treasure which France has to incur to maintain these colonies. Figures tell cold facts. If the French people realized how few are the ships carrying the French flag in the commercial world compared with those of other nations, they would begin to suspect the mistake of colonization by a stay-at-home nation. And the worst sign of France's decay is the terrible evidence of her vital statistics.

Great Britain and Holland are practically republics, except that their presidents are called "queens," and are for life. Both countries show great prosperity, and so judged, would appear to offer the best form of government to-day. The vastness of the British Empire may cause her fall; the smallness of Holland may invite a swallowing up. But brave little England has become a mighty power, and brave little Holland is a model in many ways. To judge by existing facts, their system of government would appear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be the best at this moment. But no one will say that there are no faults therein. For example, in England, one of its great pieces of government machinery, the upper House of Parliament, has weak component parts—the hereditary peers who do not stand for intellect. And another deficiency is intimated by the existence of crushing poverty among the masses.

In America the failure of the republican system is becoming more evident at each Presidential and minor election. The disease of uncertainty paralyzes commercial enterprise. Business is periodically disturbed for months. Politics has become jobbery. Greedy parties control the votes and are thirsty for spoils. The growth of immense fortunes and trusts is also a menace, for labor will insist upon its share of increased prosperity. And the pension system is fast becoming a cancer of the malignant type. Hence the old classic question, which form of government is the best, is not practically answered at this moment, for all modern governments are proven faulty in their system.

The ideal government of Zionism is a confederation or a republic, with a ruler who, far from being a despotic czar or an autocratic emperor, will regard himself as really a viceroy or representative of God, the real king, who, Zionism declares, "reigns for ever and ever." Church and State will be separate, each supreme in its own domain, and both working for the same ends.

The Jewish State will have no political aims or colonial enterprise. It may not extend its borders beyond the ancient lines of the Bible from west "the river of Egypt" to east "the Euphrates," and north from the white mountains (Lebanon) to the deserts on the south.

Thus it will be eminently qualified to act unbiassed by its own interests as arbitrator between the nations of the world when political differences of importance may arise.

War will therefore be unnecessary; swords can then well be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning hooks. Nations will not need to learn war any more. The curse of conscription will not need to exist. One-third of the expenses of each government now used for war budgets will be saved, and the people under that government will be so much less taxed in proportion. As arbitrator, the Jewish State will have to curry favor with no power. There will be no reason why to its own jurists a body of jurists of other countries shall not be added.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the chair of International Law will surely be a prominent one in its State-University whose doors will be open to men of all creeds. The Torah always had and always will have but "one law for the stranger and the native." And the powerful experiences of a history of thousands of years, giving a consciousness of God in human affairs, will most effectually secure a verdict in accord with the strictest justice and righteousness. A Jewish State, the realization of the Prophets' ideal, is one of the purposes of Zionism, for it means arbitration instead of war. The ideal is one of such extreme value to the civilized world, that all nations must wish it Godspeed.

But some may say, Why to a court under the auspices of the Jews, the lowly, the long-despised Jews, should the proud nations of the earth pay respect?

Because the nations that follow the teachings of the lowly Jew, Jesus, may surely consult such a tribunal.

(II.) A model State of Society.

I do not know that any one will contend that the state of society in any of the great countries is satisfactory.

Under the surface of the best society there is much immorality. Social evil is by many excused. There is a different standard of morality for man and for woman. Religion is for many a conventionality. Not one in five of the population is a communicant, from a religious point of view. Among the working classes more evils exist. Women and girls have to work for beggarly wages with the resultant temptations. The spiritual level in factory districts and in mining districts is very low. Lawyers are a necessity, not simply to draw up contracts, as notaries in certain countries do, but to prevent their clients being taken advantage of, and, if possible, to give their clients every possible advantage in the transaction. Men in high social position manipulate the stock market, and build fortunes on the ruins of other people's fortunes. They are not ostracized from good society. Great trusts are formed which crush other people's energies. The directors are not ostracized from good society. Businesses are built up by shamefully under-paid work, as we are told by the stories of sweatshop and pittance paid for wretched toil. "The Song of the Shirt" is still the psalm of life for thousands of unfortunates. The employers are not ostracized from good society. The air which God created is free to all. The water we drink is taxed for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the municipality. But the land on which are our houses is rented for private individuals, the owners. Yet the same God who gave the air, gave the water for mankind's use; and all the earth, as we heard at Sinai, is His, and meant for all His children. Evidently some regulation of land tenure is required, for surely the present system is at fault.

In business a high code of honor is the guide for some, but not for all. Goods are sometimes misrepresented. Promises are broken. Granted that people guilty of these offences do not fix our standard of honor; yet among those who do are many who, for example, will lend money on mortgage, and though the property may depreciate in value through no fault of the one who borrows, yet they who lend will exact the full amount of the mortgage, and many people will say, "Why, of course they will, why shouldn't they?" Yet I think there is something to be said on the other side.

A model state of society, as legislated for in the Jewish code, makes holiness or purity of life its ideal. Immorality is incompatible with it. Religion in the Jewish system is far from being a conventionality. It enters into the web of daily life. Instead of one in five of the population being a communicant, every member of every family is required to observe the six sacred seasons, the "days of holy convocation," as they are called, or perhaps more correctly, "days for sacred exercises." They are, the Sabbath, for weekly spiritual exercises; Memorial and Atonement days for spiritual introspection and repentance; Passover with its lesson of freedom; Pentecost with its lesson of revelation or divine concern in human affairs, and Tabernacles with its teachings of human gratitude for divine blessings. In the Jewish system the poor are specially protected. The Jewish Code forbids grinding down the poor. "Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant, the poor and needy, of thy brethren or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates"—(Deut. xxiv. 14.) It has nothing but scorn for the man who is so greedy of gain that he "pants after the dust on the heads of the needy." Even the poor must be brought near to God, must be always provided for, must participate in the benefits of the great festive seasons. The ideal Jewish code provides for notaries and judges, and the command to "make after righteousness" is made to thunder in their ears. It pronounces "woe to those who join house to house"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for others' injury, and as for those who make corners in corn, "the people curse them." Deception of any kind in business transactions is rigorously forbidden, and the lofty ground is taken, not that these ideals must be lived up to for fear of incurring penalty of the law, but they must be lived up to out of reverence, or veneration, or love for God. Indeed, this teaching to do all that is right out of love for God is twice repeated in a Scripture section by every observant Hebrew every day of his life. It says we are to love Him with all our heart, with all our soul and with all our might. This simple creed of Love is to be in our hearts. This simple creed we are to teach our children by our own example in our homes and abroad, by expressing our gratitude to Him when we lie down and when we rise up. This simple creed is to guide our hands and guide our thoughts. It is to be the rule of our homes in private life, and the rule of our lives in public affairs. Surely, the state of society that aims for all these things is a model State. The State which Judaism aims at is just such a State.

(III.) A Model System of Education.

The Hebrew in this model State would be false to his traditions of the past centuries if he did not show the same love for learning which made his age in Spain the Golden Age, and which leads many of our best minds to-day to avail themselves of the privileges of university life in countries where they are permitted. But the education of the intellect is not the only education. The education of the hand is also necessary. The teaching of the Jewish rabbis, bidding every man love work, teach his son a trade, the fact that the rabbis themselves engaged in manual labor, the fact that so many of the Bible laws refer to agriculture and labor of all kinds; the fact that artisans such as Bezaliel and Achisamach, were called "men filled with the spirit of God," show the dignity of labor in the eyes of the Jew.

A third form of education equally provided for is the education of the heart. The inculcation of the doctrine of love above referred to, is sufficient illustration, although pages could be filled upon this subject alone. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart." "Show kindness to thine enemy, and to him that hateth thee." "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A State which has a system of education for the brain, the hand and the heart must have a model system of education. tion. And when it provides not only for the education of the heart, or human emotion, but also for the spiritual education, or the uplifting of the soul of the human being, or son of God, to God the Father, who shall not concede its ideality?

Yes! True Zionism means a model government, a model state of society, a model system of education.

Hence, true Zionists understand that their policy to-day is one of preparation for this. They realize that the Hebrews and the world at large must be educated up to these ideals. They know that as far as the Jews themselves are concerned, the culmination of Zionism, the regeneration of Palestine as a Jewish State, as God wills, will not be, cannot be achieved, until the Hebrews themselves command the respect of the Gentiles. Divine intervention to this end is looked for. "At that time I will bring you again, and at that time I will assemble you, I will appoint you for a name and a praise among all peoples of the earth, when I bring back your captives before your eyes, saith the Lord."

The Zionist programme, therefore, is preparation by moral, mental, and spiritual elevation, and in this connection let us mention its revival of the Hebrew language.

Truth to say, the Hebrew language has never been dead. It has always been a medium of communication between Hebrew communities of the East and West, and whole communities have always been able to converse in it. It has always been the language of prayer, for which there exists the example of Ezra and the last of the Prophets, who, with their coadjutors known as "the men of the Great Synagogue," chose Hebrew for the language of the ritual, still in use to-day. And they did this despite the fact that Aramaic and not Hebrew was the vernacular; that not a few of the people spoke "half in the speech of Ashdod and could not speak in the Jews' language," and that, to all the congregation, interpreters had "to give the sense" of the law, and "cause them to understand the readings."

All praise to modern Zionism, which seeks to prove the virility and adaptability of the Hebrew language by issuing Hebrew papers and periodicals, publishing Hebrew works, and translating into Hebrew books upon books of standard value, from a Shakes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pearian play to a novel by George Eliot, from Herbert Spencer's sociology to Alexander Humboldt's philosophy.

Let me now turn to yet another phase of Zionism and its activities.

For modern Zionism aims also at the protection of Hebrew interests, the rescue of the Hebrew oppressed, the rehabilitation of the Jew as a tiller of the soil, the colonization of Palestine, the exploitation of its products, and the co-operation of all existing Jewish societies to these ends.

The Alliance Israelite Universelle of France, the Anglo Jewish Association of England, the Board of Jewish Delegates of America, the Allianz of Germany, Hoveve Zion (Lovers of Zion), Shoveve Zion (Returners to Zion), etc., etc., of Europe and America, aim at exactly these things. These, except the last two, are comparatively old.

Within the last year there has been an extraordinary activity in the formation of new Zionist Societies in all countries, due to the movement which culminated in the Basle Conference last August. This conference has now passed into history, and would deserve a separate article. There are in New York city alone about forty Zionist societies, and others exist from Montreal to New Orleans. Modern Zionism has done and is doing much to rekindle the flame of Jewish Nationality. "Palestine for the Hebrews as God hath willed it" is its cry, and the Hebrew heart in every part of the globe pulsates accordingly.

But the present and pressing task of Zionism is colonization. To a large extent this task is imposed by the terrible condition of over three millions of Jews, "reconcentrados," in Russia. Zionism attempts a partial amelioration of their miserable state by sending some to Palestine.

Yet, let it be at once declared that the fulfillment of this ideal of modern Zionism; this hope of the Jew as he trod his *via dolorosa* throughout the world for eighteen centuries; this bright promise of which the prophets spoke, and of which psalmists sang, does not mean the forfeiture of citizenship or of any civic rights by any Hebrew in any country wherein he may choose to reside. He will owe and he will pay material allegiance only to the country of his adoption, complete material allegiance. He will owe only spiritual allegiance to a Hebrew State when such shall be established. That State can, and will, lay claim to no temporal rights nor to a right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to interfere in the temporalities of any country outside its own historically defined borders, as we have already observed. It will never summon Hebrews in any land to the Hebrew flag to fight against the country of their birth, or adoption, or residence.

Even as the Catholic is an American in America, loyal, law-abiding and ready to fight for the country of his birth or residence, even though the seat of his spiritual government is in distant Rome, so will be the Jew, loyal, law-abiding and ready to fight and die for the country of his birth or adoption. In fact, the possibility is even more apparent in favor of the Jew. For, unlike the Catholic, he will have no Pope to lay claim to temporal power, or to hold that obedience to him comes before obedience to his country, as is so oft alleged against the Catholic.

By his personal example of reverence in all countries, by ordering his life wherever he happens to be in accordance with his belief that a Divine supervision of human affairs exists, the Jew will fulfill his destiny in all lands. By looking to a Jewish State in Palestine, he will simply turn his heart to the central seat of his religion, thence to derive for himself the spiritual strength which he, being human, must need, and there to point humanity at large for inspirations for right living. Zionism means all this. But it means much criticism, much opposition.

The feeling against the Jew is too deeply seated, too ingrained to admit of the realization of the ideals of Zionism easily. Anti-Semitism is no phantasy. It is a painful reality. Just as all great world-movements have meant opposition, calumny, and even bloodshed, so this movement, Zionism, can never hope to succeed without conquering opposition, silencing calumny and enduring violence.

Opposition! Calumny! Violence! What a pitiful story that the race, whose daughter, Mary, gave Jesus to the world, should have been victim to these for so many centuries should to-day be "despised and rejected" by those who worship and respect that son of Mary the Jewess.

Anti-semitism exists. It has strengthened Zionism. It is not the first time in our history that our virility has been developed in adverse winds. We are ready to face more Opposition. We are ready to bear more Calumny. We are ready to endure more Violence! We know how to suffer, to endure—and to wait.

Our revenge for the past will be to turn our opponents into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our friends, our calumniators into our advocates, and those who are treating us with injustice or worse shall yet become our champions. Zionism will prove to be the solution of Anti-semitism. Greater political miracles, greater social miracles, have occurred.

To bring about a better mutual understanding between all sections of the community, is the logical aim of Zionism. It is included in the ideal of our prophets when they preach the Brotherhood of Man. Being an ideal of the prophets, it is an ideal of Zionism.

Closely linked with the ideal of Universal Brotherhood is the ideal of Universal Peace. Universal Peace can be realized and maintained only by the establishment of an international court of arbitration. Universal Peace, and the establishment of an international court of arbitration are also ideals of the Prophets. Therefore they are ideals of Zionism.

The logical result of Universal Brotherhood and Universal Peace will be Universal Happiness, the third great ideal of the Prophets, and therefore, the third great ideal of Zionism.

The condition of Universal Happiness can only be reached when a pattern State exists, to show a model government, a model state of society, and a model system of education. Zionism means these and just these, and for these it is patiently preparing.

Time may be required before these dreams become actualities. But what is time to the deathless nation?

H. PEREIRA MENDES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GRAVEYARDS AS A MENACE TO THE COMMONWEAL.

BY LOUIS WINDMÜLLER.

A RATIONAL disposition of human remains has become a serious question wherever the population of cities has increased in greater proportion than that of the country at large; and at the present moment it deserves earnest consideration, since infectious diseases prevailing in tropical climes where we carry warfare may be brought here.

The custom of burying bodies in close proximity to each other at insufficient distances from human habitation is reprehensible in the highest degree. During the continuance of their natural decay, extending over a period of some five and twenty years, they contaminate the air, pollute the earth and defile the springs, threatening disease. If we could overcome foolish prejudice and false sentiment which prevail against the ancient custom of burning the dead, we would correct a grievous wrong.

The strongest motive for the interment of remains is affection. It is customary to visit the graves of our friends, dwell in thought on the acts of kindness they have done, and adorn the mounds which cover their bodies with fragrant flowers. It is considered the sacred duty of a feeling heart thus to commemorate at least the anniversaries of their passage from the world. And the unwillingness of men to cut short the progress of the corruption which goes on, unseen, beneath these mounds, can only be explained by a sentimental yet stubborn resolution that as far as they can prevent it the remains shall never be disturbed. Having laid them to "final rest," they fondly expect them to stay in the selected inclosure, because the ground is conveyed by a title supposed to guarantee possession for all time to come.

But what do these promises mean when neither the dead nor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their living representatives can longer assert their claims? Relatives could not, if they would, dispute the right of municipalities to eminent domain nor the decision of many courts that corpses after a time cease to be property. As a matter of fact, the expectation that cemeteries shall afford a permanent resting place to the bodies interred in them is conclusively discredited by experience. Writing of old Boston graveyards, Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "The stones have been shuffled about like chess-men; nothing short of the day of judgment will tell whose dust lies beneath." When King's Chapel burial ground, in Boston, was recently invaded by a subway under Tremont street, a colony of forgotten ancestors was discovered, and promptly removed. But, of all American cities, New York—where about a hundred graveyards have been destroyed or partially abandoned since it became a city—offers the most striking examples of the changeableness of "resting places," which the history of some of its old churchyards will demonstrate.

In the early part of this century graves were in evidence in New York to such an extent that a splenetic Englishman who came to visit our shores speedily returned when he found every street lined with headstones. Tombs, such as exist around Trinity and St. Paul to-day, encircled numerous other churches. As congregations grew, many of them sought other burial grounds which were then considered safer from disturbance on account of their distance. These have in turn been overtaken and absorbed by the ever growing city.

The first graveyard in New York was situated on Morris street, near Broadway. It was removed and the ground sold at auction in 1676, when a plot was acquired opposite Wall street, described in the first charter of the city, on April 22, 1686, as "the new burial ground without the gate." It was used as such, in conjunction with Trinity Church, until city interment was prohibited. There were many graves around the old Reformed Church, called the Middle Dutch, at Nassau, Cedar and Liberty streets, which was dedicated in 1729. British soldiers were quartered there between 1776 and 1783. It was turned into a post office in 1844, and sold to the Mutual Life Insurance Company in 1882. Of numerous bones discovered when the Mutual Building was erected, none were identified.

In 1853, when Beekman street was widened, some graves in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the yard of the Presbyterian Brick Church, on the site of the present Printing House Square, were disturbed, and in 1857, when Henry J. Raymond erected the New York Times Building, the remaining bodies were removed to a block bounded by Christie, Houston, Stanton and Forsyth streets, which had been used by three Presbyterian congregations as cemeteries since 1807. When this ground was sold in 1865 the bodies, or what was left of them, were once more disturbed. No vestige remains of the numerous graves that place once contained.

St. John's burial ground, at Clarkson, Hudson and Leroy streets, formerly the property of Trinity Parish, has recently been condemned by the city and converted into a public park. Few bodies being claimed, a majority were allowed to remain. Children may now play on the turf which covers the bones of their ancestors.

About 1840, the Methodist Church on Second street, between Avenue A and First Avenue, was turned into a public school. Some 1,500 bodies that had been placed there since the beginning of the century, were not moved until 1860. Of that number fifteen only were claimed by relatives. One gentleman abandoned the skeleton of his own father, because the skull seemed too small, and the charge for separate burial too large. He therefore allowed the remains to be placed, with the others, in a common grave in Evergreen Cemetery.

About 1832 some merchants bought ground on Second street, between First and Second Avenues, and created the "New York City Marble Cemetery." Among them was Robert Lenox, who was buried in 1839, in a vault of the First Presbyterian Church, about No. 16 Wall street. When other bodies were removed with that congregation to Fifth avenue and Twelfth street, the remains of Robert were taken to this cemetery, and in 1880 they were joined by those of James, his public spirited son. Here Thomas Addis Emmet, the famous jurist, was buried; here also ex-President James Monroe and John Ericsson, builder of our monitors, rested until removed. For some time past more bodies have been taken from this cemetery than have been buried there. Long shamefully neglected, the grounds have recently been cleared of rubbish. Graceful monuments to the once wealthy dead might please the eye, if they were not overshadowed by miserable dwellings of the living poor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another "Marble Cemetery," situated one block west, is hidden by squalid houses which entirely surround it; a mysterious alley leading to it from Second Avenue is closed to the public by tall iron gates. The creditors of one Selleck Nichols conceived, about 1830, the idea of turning this part of his land into a burial ground; realizing better prices for dead tenants than they could have obtained from the living, they succeeded in getting Nichols out of difficulties. Some two thousand bodies lie there; the plot-owners included Chancellor James Kent, Dr. David Hosak and Daniel Lord. Nevertheless, the place is practically abandoned to inhabitants of adjacent tenements, who use it as a dumping ground for offal; mounds of the dead are covered with what is filthy and worthless. As deceased owners can give no title, the plot cannot be sold, and must remain worse than useless until "condemned" for the benefit of the public. It would make a capital playground for children of the poor.

When St. Mark's Cemetery, at the corner of Eleventh street and Second avenue, was abolished the bodies were transported into a common grave at Evergreen and dwellings erected which, once the pride of that neighborhood, have long since assumed an air of shabby gentility. St. Mark's Churchyard, opposite, is as yet in restricted use. Here are the remains of Peter Stuyvesant, Governor Daniel D. Tompkins, and Philip Hone; the body of Alexander T. Stewart rested here until it was stolen.

On December 17, 1729, a Portuguese Jew deeded to his coreligionists a plot of ground between James and Oliver streets, near Chatham square, to be used as a burial ground for all time. When the Bowery was extended southward in 1856, the larger part of this cemetery was condemned. In passing, I saw contractors cart away bones and skulls in broad daylight. A small, almost triangular, plot south of Oliver street, covered with mouldy tombstones bearing Hebrew inscriptions, remains undisturbed and unheeded.

Between 1846 and 1852, when burial within the limits of the city was practically prohibited, a number of cemeteries were located on Long Island in the old town of Newtown. These consist of:

Calvary	with	300	acres of	ground	and	600,000	bodies.
Lutheran	"	400	"	"	"	175,000	"
Cypress Hill	"	400	"	"	"	125,000	"
Evergreen	"	400	"	"	"	90,000	"
Several others	"	325	"	"	"	60,000	"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eighteen hundred acres of charnel fields cover one-tenth part of a district which contains 25,000 inhabitants, and a million of dead bodies. These cemeteries are close to each other, between four and five and one-half miles from the City Hall of the enlarged city, constituting almost its geographical centre; they are as near the Battery as the entrance to Central Park, three miles nearer than Columbia College. The ground between them and the East River is sure to be improved; it would furnish a natural outlet for the congested population of the eastern districts in Manhattan. A bridge over Blackwell's Island, which could be built for a comparatively small sum, would make Newtown more accessible than Harlem is, and draw a multitude of residents to a territory now largely dedicated to the dead. The city authorities should prohibit interments before the number is allowed to swell so that their removal shall be a physical impossibility.

In 1860, when bodies interred in the cemetery of the Eighteenth Street Methodist Church were removed from Forty-fourth street and Eighth avenue to huge vaults in the rear of the church on Nineteenth street, it was considered quite an undertaking; fifteen to twenty were piled over each other, and many were crushed by the weight of those placed upon them. The son of the sexton, who assisted in the removal, fainted and lost the sense of smell, which he never recovered. In 1875, some eight hundred of these bodies, all that could then be found, were again removed to a common grave at Woodlawn.

I might refer to other churchyards which have been forgotten; one of the oldest was the South Dutch Reformed, opened in 1691, on Garden street (now Exchange place), on the north side, between Broad and William streets, the headstones of which remained in sight of the occupants of adjoining buildings long after the destruction of the church.

These examples show how delusive is the presumption that the "dwellings of the dead" are secure against intrusion. Parts of Calvary, where the remains of Captain Raphael Semmes rest, show the example of a constantly used cemetery, which apparently is neglected. Burials number 18,000 annually; seventeen only out of 13,000 owners provide for the care of their plots. When sold the trustees are not obliged to look after them, so that most graves are slighted. Innumerable stones, many having an ungainly appearance, are placed close together, barely leaving room for vegetation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A visit to any old cemetery would convince the impartial observer that, after their departure, affection for the remains of our dear ones dies out sooner than we care to acknowledge. Few stones of recent dates attest that the inmates have not been forgotten; the rest are in a state of greater or less decay. Everybody fondly hopes that his memory will last. It is, nevertheless, a fact that within the life of one generation the preceding one is generally doomed to oblivion; it takes more time for the flesh of a body to decompose than its memory is apt to live. And to save the feelings of the few survivors who remember the deceased for a brief period, we allow the putrifying remains of one who would have shrunk from inflicting injury, while living, to become an unnecessary menace after his death.

A great obstacle to the only rational treatment of remains has always been and is now the expectation of a resurrection of the actual body, which very many cannot separate from the belief in immortality.

According to the faith of the Egyptians, the soul after death had for thousands of years to pass through the bodies of different animals, returning finally in a purified state to the body it once had occupied. The preservation of the body became, therefore, an object of the utmost importance, and corpses were embalmed by a costly and tedious process. The Egyptians considered their houses mere hostelries, their tombs dwellings, for the construction of which everybody prepared according to his means.

The Jews adopted the custom of Egyptian burial in a modified form. Carefully washing the body, they placed it, wrapped in a winding sheet or shroud, in a distant cave. The Talmud expresses an expectation of resurrection, even on the advent of the Messiah, when the righteous in Israel would enjoy a millennium of bliss.

The Mohammedans look for a resurrection of the body and its reunion with the soul at doomsday. Hence, they bury each body in a separate grave, and consider its disturbance a sacrilege. Large tracts of valuable lands, over which contagion has often spread with alarming rapidity, are wasted; soil and climate favor production of abundant crops, if corn were planted instead of corpses.

Misconception of the meaning of resuscitation induced early Christians to discard the pyre, the use of which Hindoos, Greeks and Romans had found expedient, and to adopt the Jewish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

custom of burial. God, doubtless, has the power to collect not only bones but the very atoms which compose our mortal frames, whether they consist of ashes into which a Gorini furnace had converted them in an hour, and which then were scattered to the four winds of heaven, or whether they had gradually been turned by decomposition into a heap of dust. The slow decay injures the living; it can avail the dead nothing.

Objection to cremation by members of the medical and legal professions on the assumption that poison cannot be detected in ashes has been generally abandoned. In suspicious cases intestines might be preserved before the rest of the corpse is consigned to the furnace; but, in any case, fire would scarcely consume a mineral poison. On the other hand, when mineral poison is found in the stomach of a disinterred body which had been embalmed, it cannot be considered a conclusive proof of crime, because the fluid injected into such bodies usually contains arsenic. Henry Thompson, an English authority, claims that, out of five hundred thousand burials, barely five have occurred which required disinterment for the purpose of any investigation.

Some people shrink with horror from the possibility of being burned alive, but the danger is no greater than that of being buried alive. The former, indeed, may be preferable, as the agony would be over once and for all. But neither will happen, if proper medical precautions are taken.

There are other important questions of public and private economy connected with this subject. In China graves are scrupulously guarded against intrusion, because the spirits of the departed are supposed to hover over their graves until they become reunited with their bodies. Consequently, railroads can get no franchise to cross whole provinces which are used for cemeteries; and which are closed to civilization till the time of the Chinese resurrection.

In Continental Europe an average period of 25 years is generally allowed for the occupancy of a grave; in most cases its ownership reverts to the municipality, so that it may be used anew at the expiration of that period. This may seem brutal, but experience shows that it is necessary, and that here we rarely remain in possession of a lot which we purchase from a suburban cemetery longer than fifty years. The dead of London require an annual waste of 23 acres of valuable ground. If 4,000 corpses are crowded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the space of one acre, the limit in the case of the most populated graveyard, and if we accept the present rate of mortality, 20 per 1,000 inhabitants, as the standard, New York, with a population of 3,500,000, would have to provide room for 70,000 corpses, and would require annually 17½ acres to bury them in. Unless the custom is changed the available room in the vicinity of all large cities will gradually be absorbed by remains of the dead.

In considering the welfare of individuals, the expenditure of one may benefit another, but citizens should be treated on equal terms. With the exception of Greenwood, almost all cemeteries used in the neighborhood of New York are either poorly managed by churches or administered for the benefit of a few fortunate shareholders. The rural cemetery law, as amended in 1879, allows them to divide among themselves the net profits from the sale of plots. Realizing about twenty thousand dollars for an acre, which hardly cost two thousand, their investments bring large revenues and are esteemed valuable. By assuming the guise of benevolent societies, owners succeeded in evading payment of the taxes which their less fortunate neighbors are obliged to pay. The trustees are never called upon to make reports to the State, and they give but scanty information to their stockholders.

In Portugal and Japan persons dying from cholera must be cremated. In Tokio many thousand bodies are incinerated annually, and the expense rarely exceeds a couple of dollars per body. The city of Paris pays less than sixty cents for burning the remains of a pauper. The cost of a funeral is regulated by that city according to the station and vanity of the survivors, who may choose out of nine classes and pay from 18¾ francs to 7,184 francs—about half going into the treasury of the churches. The average cost of a burial in New York is $100; here are items of a bill which some of the poorest pay for the privilege:

For the grave and plain coffin	$27
" " hearse and coach	16
" " shroud and ice	9
" " undertaker, etc	3
	$55

Persons in distress take no time to consider whether the charge is reasonable, or if they can afford to pay it. It is a grievous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrong that the ignorant poor are permitted to tax themselves chiefly for the benefit of funeral interests. That it often costs a poor man more to die than to live is exemplified by an incident which recently occurred. The husband of an Irish woman was in the habit of going on periodical sprees. Once when his absence was more prolonged than usual, the poor creature was informed that Mike Murphy had been found in the river and that his body was at the morgue awaiting identification. Although the face was bruised, she recognized him by a scar on the leg and the blouse he wore. She had a woman's heart, and, forgetting the abuse he had heaped upon her, she engaged an undertaker to give him the customary funeral. That careful man of business* accepted the order only when he became secured by a policy on the life of Mr. Murphy for $180. Members of his lodge were invited to the wake and followed the body in six coaches, when he was interred in a gorgeous casket. Mrs. Murphy, having paid the bill of $165, was counting her little change and pondering what she might do to earn a living, when—Mike walked in. He had been drunk in Jersey and had been sobered by the news of his own funeral.

Rather than deny a dear relative, even if he were the vilest of his race, a Christian burial, the destitute deny themselves the necessities of life.

Mr. D. O. Mills and others are investing millions to provide decent lodgings for deserving poor while they live; are there no philanthropists who will erect crematories to relieve their distress when death visits them? It would require comparatively small amounts. Reasonable charges and continued use would make such enterprises self-sustaining. Five dollars for a decent urn burial, including religious service, would be sufficient. Whoever has been bereaved of dear ones, appreciates the craving for the comfort of religion at such a time; and no true belief conflicts with the wishes of man as to the disposition of his body. Why then should clergymen, chosen guardians of our souls, hesitate to minister to the family of the person who prefers the cleansing flame to the decomposing earth?

The history of Potter's Field in New York before it was located at Hart's Island, offers further proof of the mutability of "sub-

*A recent investigation of hospitals in Germany disclosed a practice which throws a peculiar light on devices of some followers of this calling. Nurses who promised to get their patients to become customers when dead, were paid a commission long before death was thought of by their intended victims.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

urban" graveyards. First established in 1794 at the junction of Bloomingdale and the old Boston post roads, on the present site of Madison Square, it was removed to Washington Square in 1797, where victims of the yellow fever were interred in 1822. The city bought for a Potter's Field in the following year ten acres of ground bounded by Fifth and Sixth avenues and Fortieth and Forty-second streets, where the reservoir was built in 1837. It was then moved to a square bounded by Third and Fourth avenues and Forty-ninth and Fiftieth streets, where it remained up to 1857, when by resolution of the Common Council of April 27, the 100,000 bodies that had accumulated were ordered to Ward's Island and the old ground transferred to the Woman's Hospital. Finally, the Potter's Field was placed on Hart's Island in 1870. How long it may remain there without creating uneasiness is a question. Hart's Island, fifteen miles from the City Hall, lies in the Long Island Sound, between Westchester and Sand's Point, near Travers Island, the summer home of the New York Athletic Club. Over 100,000 corpses have been interred there. Of 4,500 bodies annually buried, 150 in a trench, in registered and numbered coffins, very few are ever claimed. If the city were to incinerate those bodies instead of burying them it would save expenditure, avoid danger of contagion in times of epidemic and set a worthy example.

Innumerable proofs, furnished by scientific men of all ages, recently by the French doctor, Pasteur, show that earth retains, instead of destroying, the germs of disease contained in a body, and that in some degree it will vitiate its surroundings.

Since Hannibal's army was decimated by effluvia from an ancient graveyard he unwittingly demolished, history has repeated itself. The cholera in London in 1854 was ascribed to the upturning of earth where victims of a previous plague had been buried.

The French Academy of Medicine located the origin of diseases of the lungs and the throat in putrid emanations from the Parisian cemetery, "*Père la Chaise.*" Of the older churchyards of Paris, once honeycombed with graves, that of the "Innocents" is remarkable. Established on the present site of the market called "*Halles Centrales,*" it bred pestilence for centuries without hindrance. Finally, it became notorious as a nuisance, so that it had to be abolished. Innumerable skeletons were unceremoniously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carted to the Catacombs on April 7, 1786. Lyon Playfair asserts that Roman fever originates not in the Pontine Marshes, but in decaying bodies of the millions buried in the Eternal City. Doctor Domingo Freire found in cemeteries of Rio de Janeiro myriads of microbes in corpses, identical with those in persons stricken with yellow fever, a year after burial.

Drainage from cemeteries in Philadelphia has polluted water of the Fairmount reservoir. The centennial dysentery of 1876 has been attributed to this cause. A continued prevalence of typhoid fever in this sparsely inhabited city must be ascribed to the same cause.

Mortality by yellow fever was twice as large in portions of New Orleans where large cemeteries are located than elsewhere.

In Cuba this plague rages almost continually. Bodies of the victims of disease and Spanish cruelty, estimated to number 200,000, are inadequately protected against high temperature and moisture; their emanations are a menace to our soldiers more terrible than Spanish guns. American officers should be delegated to destroy these bodies before they do harm. The Austrian Government permits the destruction of those who have fallen on the field of battle by the erection of pyres, a practice which ought to be made obligatory on the military authorities of all civilized nations. Over a hundred thousand bodies of Napoleon's army of invasion were cremated in 1812 by Russians. More men died before Sebastopol by inhaling miasma of putrified bodies than were killed by the enemy. Some 40,000 corpses poisoned the air after the battle of Sedan, until inhabitants of adjacent Belgian villages prevailed on their government to appoint in 1871 an officer to relieve the distress. By saturating them with naphtha, he succeeded in burning 300 bodies in an hour, until all were consumed. Long experience in the East Indies has shown that danger increases with moist heat. Neither burial nor disinfectants can sufficiently protect the health of our army.

Dr. Samuel Latham Mitchill said in a report to our Common Council May 30, 1825: "Earth purifies contents of graves on the principle that water, in cleansing clothes, becomes itself foul."

A commission recently appointed to investigate sanitary conditions of all graveyards in Denmark, was obliged to condemn 605 out of a total number of 650. German authorities have forbidden the use of water from any well situated within 300 yards of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grave. Experience has shown that cemeteries should, by law, be banished far outside the limits of any city; that no grave should be opened before complete decomposition of the body, and that therefore only one body should be permitted in one grave. Graves not less than ten feet deep should be located in dry, porous soil only.

Precautions like these would lessen the danger, but no method, other than cremation, will absolutely destroy all germs of sickness in a cast-off body—none by which, without giving offense, it can swiftly be converted into ashes.

Our veneration for Alexander Hamilton did not originate with his handsome memorial in Trinity churchyard; no statue in Westminster Abbey can express the love Englishmen cherish for Gladstone. Discoverers of the hidden powers of nature, composers of our sweet melodies, teachers of morals and religion need no lettered stones to remind posterity of their existence.

Since thirty years ago, cremation has been reintroduced in civilized communities, many thousand bodies have thus been disposed of, including those of Hans von Bülow, George du Maurier, Jacob Moleschott, F. Gregorovius and Anton Seidl. Instead of condemning their memory, because they refused to allow their corpses to become offensive, let us follow their noble example and help to remove one of the most odious stains on our civilization. Then we may hope some day to enjoy the pleasures of life without fear of the dead.

LOUIS WINDMÜLLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING BROTHERHOOD.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES WALDSTEIN, PH. D., LATE DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN ARCHÆOLOGICAL SCHOOL, ATHENS.

THE discussion of an Anglo-Saxon alliance, while evoking almost universal enthusiasm and approval, both in Great Britain and in the United States, has called forth serious criticisms and strictures. These objections have come from those who are either decidedly inimical to such an alliance, or who at least show no friendly attitude toward it, but they have been undoubtedly directed toward the weakest points of this great and all-important scheme. When, however, we find that these vulnerable parts are in no way essential to the main stem and body, and that, by lopping them off, we can ensure the only form of sane and healthy growth, these criticisms ought to be gratefully considered at this early stage.

Mr. Davitt has shown that the American nation cannot be considered as consisting of Anglo-Saxons. He has pointed to the people of Irish birth or descent as a strong component element in the American nation. That this is true as regards the Irish cannot be doubted, and it can be extended to other nationalities within the American people clearly not of Anglo-Saxon origin. Whatever the practical reasons for speaking of such an alliance as an Anglo-Saxon Alliance may be, as a matter of accurate statement these terms can never convey and cover adequately the ideas which they are meant to represent. An alliance between the British Empire and the United States of America cannot rightly be called an Anglo-Saxon alliance; nor do we mean "Anglo-Saxon" when we have in mind the British Empire, or even the English people.

Take the case of the English people. Who can define, with any claim to scientific accuracy, the ethnological elements to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found in the earliest pre-historic inhabitants who were followed by Celts, Romans, Angles, Jutes, Danes, Saxons and Normans? Who can give accurate value, in the formation of the English people, its government, policy, its intellectual, social and economical life, to the subsequent immigration of Dutch and Flemish, French Huguenot, Italian, Jewish weavers and craftsmen, bankers and traders, thinkers and artists? All these elements combined and intermingled, merged and fused into one another in the social and political unity of the people, have made the Briitsh Empire of to-day. It profits little to disintegrate these component parts and weigh them separately in the scales of abstract science; it mars much, however, to turn this inaccurate abstract thought into action, into practical life and politics. If this be true of the dwellers in England itself, and of the English people of the present, it is still more true when we consider Ireland, not to mention the transfusion of the Anglo-Saxon in Scotland with Celtic and other ethnological elements.

Unfortunately, the misdeeds and blunders of those who governed England in the past, as well as the leading questions of actual politics in our own days, have made the Irish question synonymous with the measure of separateness claimed by, or to be given to, the inhabitants of Ireland. But there is another side to the Irish question which should be recognized as equally interesting and instructive. That is the actual and historical claims which Irish people have to be an integral and important part of the British people, and in the making of the British Empire. If there be glory in the making of such an empire and justified pride in the strength and superiority of such a nation, the Irish people, whether they accept it or not, have an undeniable title to such glory. I am not only thinking of great individuals who made, framed or modified the lasting fabric of the empire. I am not only bearing in mind the huge number of great Englishmen who inherited their personal greatness perhaps more from their Irish mother than from their English father; but I am thinking of the compact army of Irish Britons who have helped to fight British battles, and of the armies of working men who have contributed by their skill and by their labor to the supremacy of British manufacture and trade, and who had so great a share in the early formation of the thriving British colonies.

Can we, even after a hasty consideration of these facts, use the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

term Anglo-Saxon in connection with Greater Britain in any way except as a figure of speech, and a very inaccurate one at that? And when such a figure of speech is not only misleading in thought, but may offend the feelings of great masses of people and thus cripple or stultify or misdirect action, what use can there be in using it at all?

If now we turn to the United States, the term Anglo-Saxon is still more inaccurate and misleading. It is true, and will always remain so, that the substructure of American national life is English in language, and in its social and political institutions. But ethnologically the American nation presents a huge and unequalled mixture of different European races.

The term "Anglo-Saxon," accordingly, besides being inaccurately pedantic and fundamentally untrue when used as signifying the uniting element between the two great peoples, is as misleading in America as it is in Great Britain, and comes dangerously near to the natural prejudices of both peoples. These prejudices can be skillfully awakened and intensified, and will be effectively used on the numerous occasions which will present themselves, by those whose interest it is to keep the two nations asunder.

Further, I object to the term "Anglo-Saxon," when used to qualify the amity or alliance between Great Britain and the United States, because it opens the door to that most baneful and pernicious of modern national diseases, namely, Ethnological Chauvinism. The slightest infusion of such a spirit suggested by the term "Anglo-Saxon" will not only stultify the efforts toward closer national amity, but may produce disintegrating disturbances even in the internal national life of these countries.

Chauvinism can in no sense be called an outcome, or even a modification, of patriotism. They are two distinct, if not opposed, ideas, the following of either of which points to characters and temperaments as different as the generous are from the covetous. Patriotism is a positive attitude of the soul, Chauvinism is a negative tendency or passion. Patriotism is the love of and devotion to the fatherland, to the wider or the more restricted home, and to the common interests and aspirations and ideals of these. Chauvinism marks an attitude antagonistic to all persons, interests and ideas, not within this wider or narrower fatherland or home. Patriotism is love, Chauvinism is jealousy. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loving temperament makes for expansion, the jealous tends toward contraction and restriction. While the patriot who loves his people and his country is therefore likely to be tolerant, even generous and affectionate, toward the stranger, the Chauvinist is likely to direct the burning fire of his animosity even toward special spheres and groupings within his own country. Now, this vice of hatred and envy, which may have existed in all times and places of human history, has in our own times received a peculiar character, a special formulation, with an attempt at justification. I have tried to qualify the general Chauvinism in the form predominant in our time by the attribute, "Ethnological Chauvinism."

The origin of this disease within the nations of Europe may be traced back first to Napoleon, when, with the inner growth of France and its powers and his successes in Italy, he coupled the designed enfeeblement, if not the destruction, of the German Empire by its division into insignificant principalities under his own influence. There is no doubt he conceived the bold idea of the predominance of the Latin race and empire over the Teutonic race and over the world in general. But he found himself wedged in between two forces which checked the advance of this Latin Hegemony and ultimately crushed him. On the one side was the Slav, on the other side the Briton. He succeeded for the time in repressing the Teuton, but he failed both in Russia and in his struggle with Great Britain.

As a reaction against this Latin wave, which submerged the Teuton Empire, the German patriots endeavored to revive the vitality of the sturdy Teutonic oak. But, while the Latin crusade had for its inspiring preacher the great leader and man of action himself, the Germanic revival fell to the lot of the theorist and thinker, and a German philosopher and professor, Fichte, in his "*Reden an die Deutsche Nation,*" was the fullest exponent of its views. These again were further formulated and carried into the realms of romantic thought, theory and science by the learned enthusiasts who led the Revolution of 1848 in Germany.

But, again, there turned up a great man of action, who, knowing his countrymen and the trend of the times, utilized all these influences to weld together the separate blocks—smoothly polished marbles of Prince-ridden principalities, and clumsy, unhewn stones and rubble-stones of independent cities and towns—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the huge edifice of the German Empire. The scientific spirit which was pervading the civilized world of Western Europe was recognized by Bismarck as a useful force which could be turned into practical advantage for the great purpose he had in view. He called upon the German professor—even the ethnologist, philologist and historian—and they obeyed his command with readiness and alacrity. The theoretical and scientific lever with which these huge building blocks were to be raised in order to construct the German Empire was to be the scientific establishment of the unity of the German people, based upon the unity of Germanic races. An historical basis for German unity was not enough, an ethnological, racial unity had to be established. The historical and philological literature of German university professors belonging to the time of Bismarck's ascendancy can almost be recognized and classified by their relation to the problem of establishing, fixing, and distinguishing from other races the laws and customs, literature, languages and religions, the life and thought, the productions and the aspirations of the Germanic races.

This influence went beyond the bounds of Germany; by a sympathy in England, Freeman and those who felt with him thumped the Saxon drum; while, by contrast, in France the *Fustel de Coulanges* played variations in softer strains on the theme of the *Cité Antique.* In course of time Russia, in the growing vigor of its racial and national expansion, formulated and developed its Pan-Slavistic theory and war cry.

The distinctive feature in this modern version of the old story of national lust of power is, that it now assumed a more serious and stately garb of historical justice in the pedantic pretensions of its inaccurate ethnological theories. The absurdity of any application of such ethnological theories to the practical politics of modern nations at once becomes manifest when an attempt is made to classify the inhabitants of any one of these western nations by means of such racial distinctions. What becomes of the racial unity of the present German Empire, if we consider the Slavs of Prussia, the Wends in the north and the tangle of different racial occupations and interminglings during the last thousand years within every portion of the German country? And the same applies to France and England, Italy and Spain.

But the German professor, with his political brief wrapped

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

round his lecture notes, was forced further afield and deeper down in his "scientific" distinctions. The divisions he established for the purposes of national policy were but minor sub-divisions of broader ethnological distinctions. Here the philologist took the lead and established "beyond all doubt" the difference, nay, the antagonism, between the Aryan and the Semitic, which makes the Hindoo more closely related to the German and Saxon than these are to Spinoza, Mendelssohn and Heine, Carl Marx and Disraeli.

This last named classification could further be turned to practical advantage by those in Germany whose interest it would be to set one part of the German people against another section, and to create a new party or to strengthen the hands of decrepit old ones. And thus there grew up the Anti-semitic parties in Germany and elsewhere, who could give strength and some semblance of sober dignity to their party passions or violent economic theories, by so respectable a scientific justification as a racial distinction fixed thousands of years ago. This step once made, however, has necessarily led into wider and unsafer regions, the exploitation of which may ultimately lead to most disastrous results. For, when once the distinction between Aryan and Semite led to the Anti-semitic movement, religious prejudices, or, at all events, religious distinctions, were necessarily carried in the wake and tended to serious complications. Were it not for the clamorous interests of recent politics in the East and West, as well as in Africa and Asia, which absorb the attention and the passions of the nations of Europe, I believe that the current Ethnological Chauvinism would have drifted more and more into the channels of religious Chauvinism.

There were striking indications within the last few years that the ethnological game was played out. In Russia the Pan-Slavistic cry was growing feebler and feebler and was gradually merging into something like a Pan-Orthodox movement, which carried very practical, if not material, plans and purposes within the religious breast of its spiritual devotion. Feeble echoes of Pan-Anglicanism made themselves heard; while the Catholic Church followed its old tradition, and the national and Germanic ardor of Berlin, if not of the whole of Germany, was diverted from the monster statues on the hills of the Rhine and the Teutoburger forest to the national Protestant churches in the German capitals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arminius was, after all, a Pagan! And if this new old cry is silenced for a time by the din of gatling guns, the axes of the colonizer, and the hammer of the colonial prospector, it is not silenced for good and all, and will shortly be raised again.

The result of all this is that old antagonisms have been intensified by the introduction of these ethnological distinctions, and that new ones have been created to swell their nefarious phalanx. No doubt, other passions have been added to them, the greed of gold and the lust of empire.

England is the only country in Europe which has not yet been affected to any harmful extent by this disease of Chauvinism; and there is no fear that, in spite of all the provocation which the attitude of other nations toward her arouses, she will respond to them in the same tone. But, to call an alliance, or the growing amity, between Great Britain and the United States an Anglo-Saxon alliance, and to accept such a term as embodying the essential bond of union between these two great nations, would familiarize us with evil ideas, if it did not create evil passions. What brings us, and will hold us, together is something quite different, and far more potent than the empty words and the unsound theories with regard to our racial origin.

The question, then, arises: What are the essential elements which hold people together? Sir John Seeley maintained that "the chief forces which hold a community together are common nationality, common religion, common interest." I believe that this epitome errs in omitting some elements which are perhaps the most efficient in binding people together, while at least one of the three is not essential to national unity or national amity.

I should prefer to summarize these elements under the following general headings: A common country; a common nationality; a common language; common forms of government; common culture, including customs and institutions; a common history; a common religion, in so far as religion stands for the same basis of morality; and, finally, common interests.

Now, when any group of people have all these eight elements in common, they ought of necessity to form a political unity; and when a group of people have not the first of these factors (the same country) but are essentially akin in the remaining seven, they ought to develop some close form of lasting amity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the case of the people of Great Britain and of the United States, seven of these leading features are actively present.

It may even be held that the first condition, a common country, which would make of the two peoples one nation, in some sense exists for them. At all events, a country is sufficiently common to them to supply sentimental unity in this direction. For, as regards England, Seeley has well remarked, referring to a period when steam and electricity had not yet reduced the separating distance of the ocean:

> **"There is this fundamental difference between Spain and France on the one side and England on the other, that Spain and France were deeply involved in the struggle of Europe, from which England has always been able to hold herself aloof. In fact, as an island, England is distinctly nearer for practical purposes to the New World and almost belongs to it, or at least has the choice of belonging at her pleasure to the New World or to the Old."**

If we turn from the question of mere physical propinquity to the feeling of the American people as regards the country, the actual soil, of the British Islands, we come to a sentiment deep and cogent in its binding power. But a small minority of Americans would not be overcome by a sense of home the moment they arrived on British soil. The monuments on which they gaze in Westminster Abbey commemorate patriots, statesmen and poets whom they can rightly claim as essentially their own! To all these people, Great Britain is the "Old Country." This does not apply only to the Americans of distinctly British origin, but also to those of German and French and Dutch or other European descent, whose home has been sufficiently long in the United States for them to have become thoroughly nationalized through the language, the customs and institutions which are practically the same in both countries. Such an one has read his Shakespeare, Macaulay and Walter Scott from his childhood upward; and thus Westminster Abbey and Stratford-on-Avon and Kenilworth and Scotland strike an old familiar chord in his mind and his heart.

Leaving the question of a common country, the bond of union becomes closer the further we proceed with the other essential influences which make for unity, when once we drop the misleading and wholly illusory ethnological basis of nationality, and take into account the process of real history. We then must acknowledge that the people of Great Britain and of the United States are of one nationality. I say this in spite of the Revolutionary War,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, if I did not fear to be too paradoxical, I should almost say because of it. I mean by this, that the establishment of independence in the British Colonies of North America marks a phase in the expansion of international freedom, as the advance of representative government marks the development of national freedom; and that, as the recognition of the separate household of an adult son who has been fretting with growing animosity against the domination of parental authority re-asserts, on a new and more propitious basis, the kinship of the two, so is it in the relation of the two nations since America became free. There is but one real and material fact among many to which I wish to draw attention in view of the claims of common nationality between these two great peoples, and that is, the question of kinship and intermarriage. If statistics could be established concerning the citizens of each country, as to those who have some member of their kith and kin, however remote, residing in the country over the sea, the numbers of these would be found to be astonishingly large—at all events, much larger than such relationship between any other two nations. And in this respect the importance of the continuous process of intermarriage, which promises to grow even more frequent and effective in the future, cannot be overestimated. For intermarriage is the most important factor in welding the diversity of race into the unity of nationality.

But the unity of nationality is expressed in the state, in the laws and the forms of government, which actually hold the people together. Now, though England is a monarchy and the United States a republic, the inhabitants of both countries feel that they belong to the freest nations of the world. This freedom is the outcome of representative government, an idea and a fact born in England, of the development of which the history of the British people is one continuous illustration. It does not diminish the glory of the framers of the American Constitution to say that the central idea of liberty and self-government, which that document embodies and develops, was the natural evolution of political principles sunk deep down in their hearts and minds by their British ancestors. The reality of a common foundation for the government and all political institutions in the case of the United States and of Great Britain impresses itself upon us, not only when we ponder or generalize on things political, but when we are living our ordinary daily lives and follow the natural interests

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and needs of our several avocations. It is not merely a question of political theory and speculation, it is eminently one of practical experience and of the action of life, individual as well as collective. At every step while the Englishman or American travels abroad, even in the most civilized countries, he meets with administrative enactments, privileges, restrictions, injunctions and directions, sent from the summits of government into the busy plains of ordinary daily life, which are foreign to him and which evoke a sense of criticism, if not of irritation and revolt. The same feeling of strangeness and of foreignness constantly comes over him, if he attempts to follow their political life, whether the American consider the legislative and administrative proceedings of a European republic, or the Englishman study the laws and enactments of some other constitutional monarchy. On the other hand, every Englishman becomes readily familiar with the political system of the United States and feels at home under its rule, as the American lives happily under the laws of Great Britain and can follow with interest the work of the House of Commons.

Far more potent, however, than the ties of common descent, country and government, is the all-comprising bond of a common language. Language is the chief vehicle of human thought and its communication. No other vehicle covers the whole range of human experiences from the highest to the lowest as does language. And if we compare the more emotional, the artistic, aspect of language, with the other arts, which are all such powerful exponents of the national and historical life of a people, we must assign to the literary art an exceptional position, as conveying the distinct individuality of a nation with more directness and precision than any of the others.

But it is on the more purely linguistic side that language becomes such a force in national life and gives such distinctness and solidarity to the communities which have the same language in common. Great statesmen have ever recognized this; as is clear when we consider the efforts made in Prussia to introduce the German language into Poland, the troubles of the Austrian Empire in dealing with the Czech and German languages in Bohemia, or the power of the mere Italian language in giving substance to the cry of *Italia Irridente* in districts nowise Italian, and with populations of ethnological origin quite distinct from the main bulk of the Italian people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is further interesting to watch how delicate and sensitive an instrument a language is in reflecting peculiar, even subtle, national characteristics. A study of the nature, history and significance of the foreign words borrowed or domesticated in a language, will reveal much about the position of language in national life, and about the national life itself. In the literature of Continental nations, besides the whole vocabulary of field sports and pastimes, which they have directly borrowed in their English form, are to be found such words as "self-government," "gentleman," "fair play," "the morning tub." And in our books you will find "esprit" and "chic" and "Chauvinism" and "*homme du monde*" and "roué," as well as "Zeitgeist" and "Sehnsucht," "Gemüthlichkeit"—perhaps even "Bakshish" and "Kismet." If one ponders on such words, and what they stand for, one may learn much about the national life of the different peoples. The ideas of self-government, of fair-play, of gentleman, do not only happen to be expressed in English. The facts which the words embody—the soul of the thing—were born among the English-speaking peoples, and these terms correspond to the essential, most lasting, most prevalent and most characteristic features of the life of the people in Great Britain and in the United States.

But language in this aspect reflects more than thoughts and feelings; it shows the common customs of living as well. People who, besides speaking the same tongue, eat and drink in the same manner, find their pleasure in games and sports, and in contemplating the same plays and pageants, to whom the "morning tub" is an essential instrument of daily life, such people not only live together in peace, but they ought to live together.

I have already referred to the influence derived from the fact that we read the same books. The people of the United States hardly feel that their debit account to England, with regard to poets and writers, is greater than their credit account; because they consider British authors their own, as the Englishman claims Poe and Longfellow and Emerson, and Lowell and Bret Harte, Mark Twain, Howells and Aldrich and James. So with the artists born in America, who are fully domesticated in England, and the actors who divide their performances between the two countries, while chairs in universities and schools in America are, and have been, held by Britons, and the interchange is daily growing more active and frequent. Day by day our life in every sphere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is becoming so thoroughly interwoven and intertwined, that not only the merchant, manufacturer and farmer, but the author and artist, nay, the student in his remote study, must consider the sister country while he is working for his own.

We have, moreover, a common history. Whatever the Revolutionary War may have meant and means to the people of the United States, it can only be regarded as a natural step in the British struggle for self-government and independence. Meanwhile, the whole of American history before 1776 is to be found, not with Red Indians, but with the people of Great Britain. And what Seeley has expressed so vigorously and clearly for the Britons, when they regard Greater Britain, that the British Colonies form an integral part of Greater Britain, and that every English political view which does not include the national life of Australasia and Canada is crippled and distorted—this applies to the attitude which the Britons must hold ever to the United States. The United States have not only formed a central factor in the British history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but they are an essential element in the growth of national life in the present, and will become still more vital in the future.

I have more than once quoted Sir John Seeley's "Expansion of England." There is much in this book with which I heartily agree, still more that I admire unreservedly. But I decidedly disagree with him in the state-making importance he assigns to religion among communities on an advanced scale of political civilization. I mean the power of religion as a fixed Church or Creed in the formation of a State, as an element which binds communities together. Though a common creed may be powerful in bringing or holding together people or races or nations in comparatively early stages of development, this cannot be maintained in the more advanced stages of modern politics.

In Italy, for instance, one Church preponderates among the population, with hardly a dissentient sect that might not be considered a *negligeable* quantity. Yet it can hardly be said that this common creed was an active agent in unifying Italy in the past, or in holding together the Italian monarchy of our own immediate days. Germany, on the other hand, has in our days achieved complete Imperial unity; and yet in Prussia, a Protestant State, more than one-third are Roman Catholics; while in Baden and Bavaria nearly two-thirds are Roman Catholics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The principle of religious toleration by the state, strangely sinned against by the early Pilgrim Fathers, is one of the fundamental principles in the political constitution of the United States; and, in spite of the existence of an established church in England, this principle is becoming more effective in the political and social life of Great Britain with every day.

While religion, therefore, in the sense of a fixed Church or Creed, may be dismissed from the category of unifying influences, religion as a civilizing power, as creating or modifying the national conscience, the national ethics, as directing national aspirations and ideals, religion passing through the life and history of a people, is one of the most effective elements in political life. It leaves its deep and broad stamp upon national character, and thus creates or strengthens sympathy or antipathy, spiritual relationship or estrangement.

Thus, for instance, the Pilgrim Fathers, from the depths of their religious life, convictions and sufferings, did give a definite character to the national ethics of the United States: a stern sense of duty, of veracity and honesty, which, in spite of all individual instances in which these have been disregarded or contravened, permeate as leading principles the life of the American people in every phase. This is the historical resultant of the Puritan supremacy in America, and the British people passed through the same historical process in Europe. The Puritanism of the Commonwealth, nurtured by the Hebrew sense of abstract duty, derived direct from Moses, the Psalms and the Prophets, however violent, coarse or dry it may often have been, and however much, from an artistic or æsthetic point of view, we may deplore its effect upon the life of "Merry England," was and is a most potent factor in the historical evolution of the national ethics of Great Britain of our day.

This and many other religious elements, which in the course of history have made us think and feel as we do, the two nations have in common, and these bind us together more than could the mere adhesion to the same dogmatic creed. They make us feel at home in a country where, in the smallest dealings of daily life, we at once realize that the established expectations of truthfulness in word and deed, as well as the ultimate ideals of a high and noble life, are the same as in our own home. This common foundation of popular and national ethics and religion,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American and the Briton who have travelled far afield realize as existing to a greater degree in each of these two countries than in any other land, and this will always act as a real and practically efficient link between the two nations.

Finally, I come to the question of Interests. The state of affairs which in the last few months has brought the question of an effective amity between the two great countries—allies by the fulfillment of all the other conditions we have just examined—within such close range of possible consummation and at least serious discussion, is the best answer to the doubt concerning the commonness of interest. In spite of all the historical, national, social and ethical relationships, the most sanguine of us could not have hoped, a short time ago, to see the discussion taken up seriously for the next fifty years. And now, by one move in the Far East of several Continental powers, bound together for the time being by common interests—and interests only—and by the thrilling and far-reaching events of the immediate present, the realization of these common interests on our part has made us see with the clearness of day the essential kinship between us in every aspect of our national life.

This condition of things is not fortuitous, nor isolated, so that it occurs once now, has never occurred before, and will never occur again! Whoever studies carefully the international history of 1823 will see how strikingly parallel the conditions were then to what they are now. Then as now England, the self-governing country, stood by the United States against the Continental powers forming the Holy Alliance; and, but for England, the united action of these powers would have crushed, not only the independence of the South American states, but would have jeopardized the development of American freedom. The Monroe Doctrine was, in one sense, as much the outcome of Canning's policy, as of the genius and statesmanship of Adams and Monroe.

But the social and economical conditions in the national life of every people have altered since 1823. The increase and facility of intercommunication have made the international organism more sensitive, and with it the commercial interdependence as affecting, not only manufacture, but even agriculture, has made it impossible for a nation to remain absolutely isolated and self-contained, and will in the future, if disregarded in its vital claims, lead to desiccation and ultimate annihilation of prosperity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All great nations have now (some of them tardily) awakened to this fact. Hence the energetic activity displayed on all sides and the constant rivalry leading to the growth of Chauvinism. Great Britain, by centuries of continuous activity, probably by a natural aptitude of its people for colonization, and certainly by long national training of the government and the people, has stood powerfully in the forefront of the colonial and commercial expansion, and has therefore readily evoked the combined opposition of her several European rivals. But, as the late Austrian Premier, Goluchowski, wisely saw and stated more than a year ago, the Continental powers in this commercial struggle have to count, not only with Great Britain, but with the United States. These two go together as the most formidable rivals of the Continental powers. The United States can co-operate only with Great Britain in pursuing its material interests beyond its borders. For England is the great Free Trader, the champion of Open Ports. As a matter of fact, in South Africa and in all British Colonies, the proportion of citizens of the United States who have introduced American industries and have themselves accumulated great wealth, is much larger than people are wont to imagine. The expansion of England and its opening out of the world's ports to commerce, is *ipso facto* the expansion of American commerce without cost of blood and substance to the United States.

But these interests have to be maintained and safe-guarded against foreign prohibitive encroachment, and herein forces may have to be joined by those who have common interests. What would happen to the China trade of the United States, with its prospective growth in future years from the mere position of its Pacific coast, if Russia, Germany and France were to seize the ports and close them practically to all trade but their own? American statesmen have realized the gravity of the present situation, and have been led to recognize the interests which bind their country to Great Britain.

The trend of national and international life for the last hundred years has been toward the expansion of international trade into regions that formerly did not come actively into the cognizance of the European diplomat; and each state individually, or those with common interests collectively, must be prepared to guard and enforce this expansion. If the United States and any one of the British Colonies disregard this paramount interest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their future and do not strengthen themselves by firm amity or alliance where such alliance is on every ground natural and imperative, they will some day find their national development and expansion checked. They will then come under the domination or tutelage of one of these great powers or a group of several of them, and the interests of such leading states will be paramount and dictate the course of national life to the one held in tutelage.

All this, however, would be rendered impossible by a great English-speaking Brotherhood. The Continental Powers know this, and the plan of their diplomacy must be to keep Great Britain and the United States asunder by playing them off one against the other. And for this the term "Anglo-Saxon" must yield them an acceptable opportunity.

We must not forget, however, that, after all, commerce is not everything. It is but the forerunner of civilization and receives its moral justification in that fact. Britons and Americans stand in the forefront of civilization; in political, social and economical education they stand as high as any nation, and higher than any group of nations that could be massed against them. In furthering our sphere of influence we are necessarily spreading the most advanced and highest results of man's collective efforts in the history of his civilization. An English-speaking Brotherhood will, after all, only be a step and link in the general alliance of civilized peoples. Its main principles and final objects will be those to which the highest and most cultured members of the French, German and even Russian nation would subscribe, and in so far, they would morally be members of this alliance.

Ideals are the lasting generalizations of past experiences and future aspirations. These will ever govern the world and stimulate men to action in one direction instead of another. These ideals are the same to the people of Great Britain and of the United States, and that is at once the highest and the most lasting bond of union.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DISTANT POSSESSIONS—THE PARTING OF THE WAYS.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

TWICE only have the American people been called upon to decide a question of such vital import as that now before them.

Is the Republic, the apostle of Triumphant Democracy, of the rule of the people, to abandon her political creed and endeavor to establish in other lands the rule of the foreigner over the people, Triumphant Despotism?

Is the Republic to remain one homogeneous whole, one united people, or to become a scattered and disjointed aggregate of widely separated and alien races?

Is she to continue the task of developing her vast continent until it holds a population as great as that of Europe, all Americans, or to abandon that destiny to annex, and to attempt to govern, other far distant parts of the world as outlying possessions, which can never be integral parts of the Republic?

Is she to exchange internal growth and advancement for the development of external possessions which can never be really hers in any fuller sense than India is British or Cochin-China French? Such is the portentous question of the day. Two equally important questions the American people have decided wisely, and their flag now waves over the greater portion of the English-speaking race; their country is the richest of all countries, first in manufactures, in mining and in commerce (home and foreign), first this year also in exports. But, better than this, the average condition of its people in education and in living is the best. The luxuries of the masses in other lands are the necessaries of life for ours. The schoolhouse and the church are nowhere so widely distributed. Progress in the arts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and sciences is surprising. In international affairs her influence grows so fast and foreshadows so much, that one of the foremost statesmen has recently warned Europe that it must combine against her if it is to hold its own in the industrial world. The Republic remains one solid whole, its estate enclosed in a ring fence, united, impregnable, triumphant; clearly destined to become the foremost power of the world, if she continue to follow the true path. Such are the fruits of wise judgment in deciding the two great issues of the past, Independence and The Union.

In considering the issue now before us, the agitator, the demagogue, has no part. Not feeling, not passion, but deliberate judgment alone should have place. The question should be calmly weighed; it is not a matter of party, nor of class; for the fundamental interest of every citizen is a common interest, that which is best for the poorest being best for the richest. Let us, therefore, reason together and be well assured, before we change our position, that we are making no plunge into an abyss. Happily, we have the experience of others to guide us, the most instructive being that of our own race in Great Britain.

There are two kinds of national possessions, one colonies, the other dependencies. In the former we establish and reproduce our own race. Thus Britain has peopled Canada and Australia with English-speaking people, who have naturally adopted our ideas of self-government. That the world has benefited thereby goes without saying; that Britain has done a great work as the mother of nations is becoming more and more appreciated the more the student learns of worldwide affairs. No nation that ever existed has done so much for the progress of the world as the little islands in the North Sea, known as Britain.

With "dependencies" it is otherwise. The most grievous burden which Britain has upon her shoulders is that of India, for there it is impossible for our race to grow. The child of English-speaking parents must be removed and reared in Britain. The British Indian official must have long respites in his native land. India means death to our race. The characteristic feature of a "dependency" is that the acquiring power cannot reproduce its own race there.

Inasmuch as the territories outside our own continent which our country may be tempted to annex cannot be "colonies," but only "dependencies," we need not dwell particularly upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advantages or disadvantages of the former, although the writer is in thorough accord with Disraeli, who said even of colonies: "Our colonies are millstones round the neck of Britain; they lean upon us while they are weak, and leave us when they become strong." This is just what our Republic did with Britain.

There was something to be said for colonies from the point of view of pecuniary gain in the olden days, when they were treated as the legitimate spoil of the conqueror. It is Spain's fatal mistake that she has never realized that it is impossible to follow this policy in our day. Britain is the only country which has realized this truth. British colonies have complete self-government; they even tax the products of their own motherland. That Britain "possesses" her colonies is a mere figure of speech; that her colonies "possess" her is nearer the truth. "Our Colonial Empire" seems a big phrase, but, as far as material benefits are concerned, the balance is the other way. Thus, even loyal Canada trades more with us than with Britain. She buys her Union Jacks in New York. Trade does not follow the flag in our day; it scents the lowest price current. There is no patriotism in exchanges.

Some of the organs of manufacturing interests, we observe, favor foreign possessions as necessary or helpful markets for our products. But the exports of the United States this year are greater than those of any other nation in the world. Even Britain's exports are less, yet Britain "possesses," it is said, a hundred "colonies" and "dependencies" scattered all over the world. The fact that the United States has none does not prevent her products and manufactures from invading Japan, China, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and all parts of the world in competition with those of Britain. "Possession" of colonies or dependencies is not necessary for trade reasons. What her colonies are valued for, and justly so, by Britain, is the happiness and pride which the mother feels in her children. The instinct of motherhood is gratified, and no one living places a higher estimate upon the sentiment than I do. Britain is the kindest of mothers, and well deserves the devotion of her children.

If we could establish colonies of Americans, and grow Americans in any part of the world now unpopulated and unclaimed by any of the great powers, and thus follow the example of Britain, heart and mind might tell us that we should have to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

think twice, yea, thrice, before deciding adversely. Even then our decision should be adverse; but there is at present no such question before us. What we have to face is the question whether we should embark upon the difficult and dangerous policy of undertaking the government of alien races in lands where it is impossible for our own race to be produced.

As long as we remain free from distant possessions we are impregnable against serious attack; yet, it is true, we have to consider what obligations may fall upon us of an international character requiring us to send our forces to points beyond our own territory. Up to this time we have disclaimed all intention to interfere with affairs beyond our own continent, and only claimed the right to watch over American interests according to the Monroe Doctrine, which is now firmly established. This carries with it serious responsibilities, no doubt, which we cannot escape. European nations must consult us upon territorial questions pertaining to our Continent, but this makes no tremendous demand upon our military or naval forces. We are at home, as it were, near our base, and sure of the support of the power in whose behalf and on whose request we may act. If it be found essential to possess a coaling station at Porto Rico for future possible, though not probable, contingencies, there is no insuperable objection. Neither would the control of the West Indies be alarming, if pressed upon us by Britain, since the islands are small and the populations must remain insignificant and without national aspirations. Besides, they are upon our own shores, American in every sense. Their defense by us would be easy. No protest need be entered against such legitimate and peaceful expansion in our own hemisphere, should events work in that direction. I am no "Little" American, afraid of growth, either in population or territory, provided always that the new territory be American and that it will produce Americans, and not foreign races bound in time to be false to the Republic in order to be true to themselves.

As I write, the cable announces the annexation of Hawaii, which is more serious, but the argument for this has been the necessity for holding the only coaling station in the Pacific so situated as to be essential to any power desirous of successfully attacking our Pacific coast. Until the Nicaragua Canal is made, it is impossible to deny the cogency of this contention. We need

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not consider it a measure of offense or aggression, but as strictly defensive. The population of the islands is so small that national aspirations are not to be encountered, which is a great matter, nor is it obtained by conquest. It is ours by a vote of its people, which robs its acquisition of many dangers. Let us hope that our far outlying possessions may end with Hawaii.

To reduce it to the concrete, the question is: Shall we attempt to establish ourselves as a power in the Far East and possess the Philippines for glory? The glory we already have, in Dewey's victory overcoming the power of Spain in a manner which adds one more to the many laurels of the American navy, which, from its infancy till now, has divided the laurels with Britain upon the sea. The Philippines have about seven and a half millions of people, composed of races bitterly hostile to one another, alien races, ignorant of our language and institutions. Americans cannot be grown there. The islands have been exploited for the benefit of Spain, against whom they have twice rebelled, like the Cubans; but even Spain has received little pecuniary benefit from them. The estimated revenue of the Philippines in 1894-95 was £2,715,980, the expenditure being £2,656,-026, leaving a net result of about $300,000. The United States could obtain even this trifling sum from the inhabitants only by oppressing them as Spain has done. But, if we take the Philippines, we shall be forced to govern them as generously as Britain governs her dependencies, which means that they will yield us nothing, and probably be a source of annual expense. Certainly, they will be a grievous drain upon revenue if we consider the enormous army and navy which we shall be forced to maintain upon their account.

There are many objections to our undertaking the government of dependencies; one I venture to submit as being peculiar to ourselves. We should be placed in a wrong position. Consider Great Britain in India to-day. She has established schools and taught the people our language. In the Philippines, we may assume that we should do the same, and with similar results? To travel through India as an American is a point of great advantage if one wishes to know the people of India and their aspirations. They unfold to Americans their inmost thoughts, which they very naturally withhold from their masters, the British. When in India, I talked with many who had received an English education in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British schools; and found that they had read and pondered most upon Cromwell and Hampden, Wallace and Bruce, and Tell; upon Washington and Franklin. The Briton is sowing the seed of rebellion with one hand in his schools—for education makes rebels—while with the other he is oppressing patriots who desire the independence of their country. The national patriotism upon which a Briton plumes himself he must repress in India. It is only a matter of time when India, the so-called gem of the British crown, is to glitter red again. British control of India is rendered possible to-day only by the division of races, or rather of religions there. The Hindoos and Mohammedans still mistrust each other more than they do the British, but caste is rapidly passing away, and religious prejudices are softening. Whenever this distrust disappears, Britain is liable to be expelled, at a loss of life and treasure which cannot be computed. The aspirations of a people for independent existence are seldom repressed, nor, according to American ideas hitherto, should they be. If it be a noble aspiration for the Indian or the Cuban, as it was for the citizen of the United States himself, and for the various South American republics once under Spain, to have a country to live and, if necessary, to die for, why is not the revolt noble which the man of the Philippines has been making against Spain? Is it possible that the Republic is to be placed in the position of the suppressor of the Philippine struggle for independence? Surely, that is impossible. With what face shall we hang in the schoolhouses of the Philippines the Declaration of our own Independence, and yet deny independence to them? What response will the heart of the Philippine Islander make, as he reads of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation? Are we to practise independence and preach subordination, to teach rebellion in our books, yet to stamp it out with our swords, to sow the seed of revolt and expect the harvest of loyalty? President McKinley's call for volunteers to fight for Cuban independence against the cruel dominion of Spain meets with prompt response, but who would answer the call of the President of an "imperial" republic for free citizens to fight the Washington and slaughter the patriots of some distant dependency which struggles for independence?

It has hitherto been the glorious mission of the Republic to establish upon secure foundations Trimphant Democracy, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world now understands government of the people for the people and by the people. Tires the Republic so soon of its mission that it must, perforce, discard it to undertake the impossible task of establishing Triumphant Despotism, the rule of the foreigner over the people, and must the millions of the Philippines who have been asserting their God-given right to govern themselves, be the first victims of Americans, whose proudest boast is that they conquered independence for themselves?

Let another phase of the question be carefully weighed. Europe is to-day an armed camp, not chiefly because the home territories of its various nations are threatened, but because of fear of aggressive action upon the part of other nations touching outlying "possessions." France resents British control of Egypt and is fearful of its West African possessions; Russia seeks Chinese territory, with a view to expansion to the Pacific; Germany also seeks distant possessions; Britain, who has acquired so many dependencies, is so fearful of an attack upon them that this year she is spending nearly eighty millions of dollars upon additional warships, and Russia, Germany and France follow suit. Japan is a new element of anxiety; and by the end of the year it is computed she will have 67 formidable ships of war. The naval powers of Europe, and Japan also, are apparently determined to be prepared for a terrific struggle for possessions in the Far East, close to the Philippines—and why not for these islands themselves? Into this vortex the Republic is cordially invited to enter by those powers who expect her policy to be of benefit to them, but her action is jealously watched by those who fear that her power might be used against them.

It has never been considered the part of wisdom to thrust one's hand into the hornet's nest, and it does seem as if the United States must lose all claim to ordinary prudence and good sense if she enter this arena, and become involved in the intrigues and threats of war which make Europe an armed camp.

It is the parting of the ways. We have a continent to populate and develop; there are only 23 persons to the square mile in the United States. England has 370, Belgium 571, Germany 250. A tithe of the cost of maintaining our sway over the Philippines would improve our internal waterways; deepen our harbors; build the Nicaraguan Canal; construct a waterway to the ocean from the Great Lakes; an inland canal along the Atlantic seaboard; a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

canal across Florida, saving 800 miles distance between New York and New Orleans; connect Lake Michigan with the Mississippi; deepen all the harbors upon the lakes; build a canal from Lake Erie to the Allegheny River; slackwater through movable dams the entire length of the Ohio River to Cairo; thoroughly improve the Lower and Upper Mississippi, and all our seaboard harbors. All these enterprises would be as nothing in cost in comparison to the sums required for the experiment of possessing the Philippine Islands, 7,000 miles from our shores. If the object be to render our Republic powerful among nations, can there be any doubt as to which policy is the better? To be more powerful at home is the surest way to be more powerful abroad. To-day the Republic stands the friend of all nations, the ally of none; she has no ambitious designs upon the territory of any power upon another continent; she crosses none of their ambitious designs, evokes no jealousy of the bitter sort, inspires no fears; she is not one of them, scrambling for "possessions;" she stands apart, pursuing her own great mission, and teaching all nations by example. Let her become a power annexing foreign territory, and all is changed in a moment.

If we are to compete with other nations for foreign possessions we must have a navy like theirs. It should be superior to any other navy, or we play a second part. It is not enough to have a navy equal to that of Russia or of France, for Russia and France may combine against us just as they may against Britain. We at once enter the field as a rival of Britain, the chief possessor of foreign possessions, and who can guarantee that we shall not even have to measure our power against her?

What it means to enter the list of military and naval powers having foreign possessions may be gathered from the following considerations. First, look at our future navy. If it is only to equal that of France it means 51 battleships; if of Russia, 40 battleships. If we cannot play the game without being at least the equal of any of our rivals, then 80 battleships is the number Britain possesses. We now have only 4, with 5 building. Cruisers, armed and unarmed, swell the number threefold, Britain having 273 ships of the line built or ordered, with 308 torpedo boats in addition; France having 134 ships of the line and 269 torpedo boats. All these nations are adding ships rapidly. Every armor and gun making plant in the world is busy night and day. Ships

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are indispensable, but recent experience shows that soldiers are equally so. While the immense armies of Europe need not be duplicated, yet we shall certainly be too weak unless our army is at least twenty times what it has been—say 500,000 men. Even then we shall be powerless as against three of our rivals. Germany's army on a peace footing numbers 562,352 men; on a war footing, 3,000,000; France's army on a peace footing, 615,413; on a war footing, 2,500,000; Russia's on a peace footing, 750,944; on a war footing, 2,512,143. Even Spain has an army, as we are discovering in Cuba. It foots up on a peace footing 128,000; on a war footing, 1,083,000 men. All Spaniards, like all Frenchmen, and Germans, over 19 years of age, are subject to military service. They are in fact first soldiers, then citizens.

This drain upon the resources of these countries has become a necessity from their respective positions, largely as graspers for foreign possessions. The United States, happily, to-day has no such necessity, her neighbors being powerless against her, since her possessions are concentrated and her power is one solid mass.

To-day two great powers in the world are compact, developing themselves in peace throughout vast coterminous territories. When war threatens they have no outlying "possessions" which can never be really "possessed," but which they are called upon to defend. They fight upon the exposed edge only of their own soil in case of attack, and are not only invulnerable, but they could not be more than inconvenienced by the world in arms against them. These powers are Russia and the United States. The attempt of Britain to check Russia, if the wild counsels of Mr. Chamberlain were followed, could end in nothing but failure. With the irresistible force of the glacier, Russia moves upon the plains below. Well for Russia, and well for the world, is her advance over pagan China, better even for Britain from the standpoint of business, for every Russian to-day trades as much with Britain as do nine Chinamen. Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, are all vulnerable, having departed from the sagacious policy of keeping possessions and power concentrated. Should the United States depart from this policy, she also must be so weakened in consequence as never to be able to play the commanding part in the world, disjointed, that she can play whenever she desires if she remain compact.

Whether the United States maintain its present unique posi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of safety or forfeit it through acquiring foreign possessions, is to be decided by its action in regard to the Philippines; for, fortunately, the independence of Cuba is assured, for this the Republic has proclaimed to the world that she has drawn the sword. But why should the less than two millions of Cuba receive national existence and the seven and a half millions of the Philippines be denied it? The United States, thus far in their history, have no page reciting self-sacrifice made for others; all their gains have been for themselves. This void is now to be grandly filled. The page which recites the resolve of the Republic to rid her neighbor Cuba from the foreign "possessor" will grow brighter with the passing centuries, which may dim many pages now deemed illustrious. Should the coming American be able to point to Cuba and the Philippines rescued from foreign domination and enjoying independence won for them by his country and given to them without money and without price, he will find no citizen of any other land able to claim for his country services so disinterested and so noble.

We repeat there is no power in the world that could do more than inconvenience the United States by attacking its fringe, which is all that the world combined could do, so long as our country is not compelled to send its forces beyond its own compact shores to defend worthless "possessions." If our country were blockaded by the united powers of the world for years, she would emerge from the embargo richer and stronger, and with her own resources more completely developed. We have little to fear from external attack. No thorough blockade of our enormous seaboard is possible; but even if it were, the few indispensable articles not produced by ourselves (if there were any such) would reach us by way of Mexico or Canada at slightly increased cost.

From every point of view we are forced to the conclusion that the past policy of the Republic is her true policy for the future; for safety, for peace, for happiness, for progress, for wealth, for power—for all that makes a nation blessed.

Not till the war drum is silent and the day of calm peace returns, can the issue be soberly considered.

Twice have the American people met crucial issues wisely, and in the third they are not to fail.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

AN ECONOMIC VIEW OF THE POPULAR LOAN.

It is gratifying to observe the popularity of the new 3 per cent. Government bond and that the $200,000,000 issued by the Government has been so largely over-subscribed. This result is not only complimentary to the patriotism of our people, but significant and auspicious as we look forward to the monetary future of the United States. A consideration, therefore, of the war loan and its economic bearings seems at this time opportune.

In marked contrast to the economic policy of Europe which has permitted, if not encouraged, the creation of great funded national obligations, it has been the historic policy of the United States to submit to almost any sacrifice in the methods of revenue and taxation rather than encourage the establishment of any form of permanent indebtedness. The American horror of a national funded debt, kept within reasonable limits, we do not share; but we are fully persuaded that the Government debt should be held by our own citizenship, and we believe the recent action of the Government should relieve our business interests of all unnecessary burdens. Not that we complain of a war tariff—for the patriotism of our people may be relied on to meet it without a murmur; but, as will more fully appear, it is doubtful economic policy to make this tariff oppressive in its relation to trade and commerce.

A review of the financial experience of the United States during and subsequent to our Civil War will illustrate our meaning. A war tariff was imposed which taxed every article in use from the cradle to the grave. Nothing knowingly escaped. Yet the country met the taxation without protest and as a patriotic duty. There was also imposed an unnecessary burden and spoliation in the issue of the Greenback—a species of fiatism which still haunts us—by which the money of the Government became the sport of gamblers, and the history of which proves it the costliest monetary experiment ever made by our country. But this folly does not belong to the present discussion.

When peace finally dawned and the chaos of war could be measurably estimated, it was found in addition to its cash outlay that the national debt approximated $3,000,000,000. The figures seemed appalling to a nation young in economic history. Still our debt was far less than the debt of Great Britain, and less, by more than half, than the debt of France to-day—while our possibilities as to wealth almost equalled those of combined Europe. More than this, our obligations were incurred in securing a final interpretation to the Constitution and the removal of the last possible difference to a homogeneous and united people. In other words the blessings issuing from the Civil War were easily worth all its cost in blood and treasure to the nation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our position then is this: The obligation incurred in saving the life and perpetuating the existence of the Union was a debt, the benefit of which inured to posterity; and it was an unreasonable hardship—as witness the panics of 1873 and 1893—to adopt an economic policy which contemplated the liquidation of this debt in a single generation. The thousands of financial wrecks along the pathway of our history, and the present inequality in the distribution of the national wealth, tell the sad story of the financial legislation of our country for more than thirty-five years. In our judgment, this debt, like the debt of England and France, and Continental Europe, should have been funded in a low rate bond and transmitted to posterity—each decade meeting in part the burden and helping to cancel the obligation represented by the Civil War. This plan, in our opinion, would have avoided the undue congestion of our national wealth; would have left us as free from financial panics as England; would have added to the general wealth and the prosperity of individuals; and left no excuse in this proud civilization for the unrest now represented in Socialism and Populism, or for the spectre of Repudiation, as represented in the demand for fiat money and the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Let us look more in detail at the advantages of the system from its economic side, and in doing this we may be assisted by analogical reasoning. The British debt at the outbreak of the Napoleonic War was $2,065,000,000; at its conclusion it represented the enormous total of $4,500,000,000. In 1860 it was $4,130,000,000; in 1870, $4,005,000,000, and in 1889, $3,500,000,000. If England in her sovereign capacity had attempted to pay off this debt in a single generation, as was the policy of the United States, it would have bankrupted every business in the British Isles, if it would not have disturbed the business of the world. It almost certainly would have resulted in the ruin of British commerce and would have driven the British merchants and manufacturers to foreign countries.

Instead of this suicidal policy, the statesmen of England wisely determined to make a virtue of necessity, until even economists have pronounced the British debt a blessing in disguise! For the British debt as represented in the British bond is carried in the pockets of the British people; its consol commands a premium in all the markets of the world; can be hypothecated as a collateral anywhere, and hence becomes a credit to the holder, upon which he can conduct any legitimate enterprise with almost the same facility as though he held the actual cash. Thus indirectly the British debt, represented in a negotiable and low rate bond, has become practically and to all intents and purposes, if not a part of, at least a valuable adjunct to the circulating medium of the United Kingdom, and the happy result of this financial policy has made the English people the bankers and lenders of the world.

Politically viewed, there is another reason why England's system is a masterly one. The individual life of the nation under this system becomes directly interested in the national welfare and credit, and each citizen is made aware of his individual responsibility and value in his government. In other words, England's debt has become a negotiable asset, owned and carried by her people, and it would be difficult to imagine a vicissitude of government or a revolution which could lead to repudiation of a debt which represents a loan to the Government by more than 236,000 of its citizens. It is not far to travel to see the advantage to this Government, if the national debt were represented in a popular bond, and held by the traders and wage-earners of the Republic. It is needless to say that Repudiation in its flimsy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disguise would not have so boldly stalked across the country under a party banner as in 1896.

Let us take also a Continental illustration. The public debt of France is more than $6,000,000,000. The funded debt, represented in the French rentes, is largely owned by individual citizens of France. At the end of the Franco-Prussian War the French Government was forced to pay an indemnity of $1,000,000,000. One hundred million dollars in three per cent. rentes were offered to the people and twice the amount subscribed in a single day. Later $150,000,000 of three per cent. rentes were offered, and a subscription of twelve-fold the amount was the immediate result. What a splendid tribute to the patriotism of France! The French rentes, like the British consol, is an important collateral asset in the business of the Republic. In fact, but for the bond system of the world, represented in negotiable securities, the claim of the Populist—that there is too little money—might find substantiation.

Economically viewed, we incline strongly to the opinion that it would prove a wise policy, not only to meet the expenses of the Spanish War by a popular loan, but also to convert the entire national debt at future renewals into a low rate bond of small denomination, and offered in installments from time to time as the citizens would invest. We venture to say that it would not be long before the wage-earners and the farmers would prefer an interest bearing bond—which works while they sleep—to idle bank accounts, and they would soon learn commercially that the bond was an asset which possessed many of the advantages of a circulating medium. And then, politically, what a bulwark it would prove to the public credit! Lombard Street and Wall Street would no longer be hobgoblins even to the Populists; the public faith would no longer be assailed by careless talk of scaling the obligations of the Government, or by threats of repudiation and liquidation in a fifty cent dollar.

We would esteem the Spanish War a reasonably cheap investment, if it will only introduce to our people the economic advantages of Popular Bonds (*i.e.*, bonds in small denominations in which all our citizens can invest), and if it will hasten the day when the American interest-bearing debt, under future renewals, is taken from syndicates and placed in the pockets of wage-earners of the United States. This will be accomplished when the bond in small denominations, from time to time, is offered to our people as an investment, and when that time comes it will be the knell of fiat money and the surest guarantee of the public credit.

S. D. McCormick.

THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER IN THE LIGHT OF EVOLUTION.

Intelligent men of to-day will probably agree that the fundamental question of religion and the vital issue between science and theology is the Efficacy of Prayer. Now, what exactly do we mean by the Efficacy of Prayer? Upon what accepted idea or fact does our belief in the Efficacy of Prayer depend?

It is evident that the consideration of these two questions does not involve the Biblical warrant or the religious duty of prayer. These can hardly be considered open questions. That which is more germane to the thought of the day, is a rational philosophy of things which justifies prayer. We have fallen upon an age which delights in what it calls "the scientific method." Scientific facts and points of view are slowly but surely modifying our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theological interpretations. With all the apprehensions that obtain in certain quarters, we believe that science or criticism or any form of demonstrated fact can do nothing to theology—to the genuine theology of the Bible and the Church—except to vindicate it, clarify it and enrich it. A fact wherever found is a divine thing. All that we have to do is to recognize it, define its relations and, as far as we can, determine its place in the universal system. Is there any place in that system for a rational belief in the Efficacy of Prayer?

But, first, what do we mean by the Efficacy of Prayer? Let us fall into no confusion or illusion touching this matter. Do we mean simply the subjective or reflex value of prayer? I concede that this is no mean value. Unquestionably, it is one of God's methods in the answering of our prayers. If the subjective effect upon him who prays were all that could be accomplished through his prayer, this alone would justify prayer. And in claiming for prayer this measure of efficacy, we occupy this tremendous coign of vantage; we do not go beyond the domain of observed and certified fact. We keep our feet on scientific ground. Prayer, in short, becomes a scientific duty. The man who refuses to pray fervently and believingly is not simply irreligious, he is unscientific.

This strange but real aspect of the matter is the result of the recent expansions of science. It dislikes the word "Metaphysics," but it finds that it cannot exhaust or explain nature by its crucibles and scalpels. There is an elusive remainder which it must take into account. Physiology, in explaining one-fourth of man, has left three-fourths to be explained by psychology. In fact, science is just beginning its serious work: This work lies in the mysterious borderland between mind and matter. Whatever our theories of mind and matter, the borderland is as real as a geographical frontier or a sea-coast. The difficulty is that this borderland is a fathomless abyss in which mind and matter interact across inappreciable distances. There our science is confronted with facts which it has only recently recognized and has not yet fully classified. The facts are the most intimate, significant, subtle, deep-rooted facts in our being. Our science is groping and fumbling among the facts; but for the most part this broad frontier-belt, where the forces of mind and body interplay, is marked in our scientific charts as "unexplored territory." Our explorations, as far as they have gone, bring out this point more and more clearly. The mind works on the body. The mental condition modifies the nervous and chemic interactions. We are lifted into unknown energies and heroisms by stimulants and reinforcements to our will. This is the grain of truth in "Faith Cures" and kindred combinations of fact and delusion. The subjective function of prayer, however, is not a delusion. Our beliefs and imaginations and desires are positive forces, and they are reinforced by infinite multiples by leaning on an Omnipotent Arm. God's answers to our prayers are no less real because they come to us on the lines of the forces by which He has made us what we are.

But the question remains, and this, we all agree, is the crucial question: Do our prayers work other than reflex result? Do they blend with and affect the play of physical law outside of ourselves? Shall a man pray for success in business? Shall a soldier pray amid the thundering guns of battle? Shall a mother pray for her sick child? She will pray at any rate. No theories can stifle her prayer. The soul in its love and agony cries to God as instinctively as the root underground thrusts its heart up to the sunlight. This is the stem on which all the religions of the world have flung out their flower

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and fruitage. The human heart, in the exigencies of life, with its changeless needs and sharpened hungers, has given hostages to the permanence of religion amid all the marches of the world's knowledge and the shifting fronts of the world's thought. Our needs and desires league themselves with the heavens. The deep within cries to the deep without. But can we hope for answer, an answer that shall slide into our lives along grooves of law and by thrust of forces which lie beyond ourselves?

This is what we mean by the Efficacy of Prayer. Now, is there any rational interpretation of the universe which makes this possible and probable? Any interpretation of the universe, of course, involves the question of God. It must either deny God or assert His being and relationships. I feel quite sure of my ground, when I say that the trend of recent scientific thought is toward a conception of the universe which furnishes new suggestions and arguments for the justification of prayer. On the other hand, I think that I am fair when I say that the science of a hundred years ago had a conception of the universe, and the religion of a hundred years ago had a conception of God, which made the Christian doctrine of prayer impossible. The religion of the day in the long run always locks hands with the science of the day. This is true of the Deism of the eighteenth century, against which the great Bishop Butler fought, and which treated the universe as a watch manufactured and wound up by God. The cosmic watch was Paley's great proof of divine intelligence and purpose in nature.

This watch is still found in some belated treatises on theology. The Deism which it represented was simply the religious side of the materialism which dominated the science of the period. The world was figured as a machine. Of course, God was figured as a machinist, who, having fashioned the wheels, sat on high and watched them revolve according to the structural laws of the machine.

But materialism is now a cast-off garment in the world's intellectual wardrobe. The science of the day has discovered that it utterly fails to cover the facts of life. Its theological analogue, Deism, has shared the same fate. It was a shallow theology which materialized the spiritual life, and was a degeneration from the theology of the great fathers and geniuses of the fourth century, like Athanasius, who argued against the pagans that God was a creator, not a carpenter. The pendulum has swung toward a new science and the older theology.

We no longer conceive the universe as a machine, but as an organism. It is a living thing. There is within it a force which makes it unfold, as a flower unfolds. Our modern science, in its doctrine of Evolution, tells us this much. Even where the mechanical conception of the universe lingers in its phraseology, our science has caught, as in the vision of the old Hebrew prophet, some glimpse of "the spirit of the living creature in the wheels." This all-pervasive, creative force in nature we call God. Science asserts His being, although it does not pronounce His name. He is immanent in nature and yet He transcends nature. The idea of His transcendence, as well as the idea of His immanence, is scientifically legitimate and necessary.

We find in ourselves something that we call "personality." This is the bottommost fact in our being and it is the highest reach of life that we know. We are part of the universe and we cannot leave out ourselves in searching for its key. God cannot be less than ourselves. We must read His nature from our own nature. He is all that we are and infinitely more. He is the cosmic force, and besides this, He is the summit and the fountain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the sentimental, intellectual and moral energy, of which we find in ourselves broken gleams and potencies.

We discover this conception of God in the Psalmists and Prophets of the Old Testament. It comes out in the progressive revelations by slowly uplifted veils. But we must go to Christ for the full delineation of the idea. What was the great word that was always on His lips, that He made the invocation of His world-prayer? "Our father who art in Heaven." As we look closely into nature, we find there a force as strong as the force of gravitation. This force is the love in the heart of fatherhood and motherhood. It knits the web of life, as the force of gravitation knits the web of matter. It is found in the lowest as well as the highest ranges of life. This force Christ put on the throne of the heavens. Nay, that does not express it! This sweetest, tenderest, strongest force that we know, Christ put in the height and depth and inmost recess and minutest process of nature. Christ shows us a Father's heart in the bosom of things, and the throbbings of that heart are the origin and motion and life and evolutional thrust and upward climbing force of the universe.

The Fatherhood of God—this is the root of the religion of Christ. The way in which He pressed it and reiterated it shows that He held it to be the root. All the facts in His religion cluster around, or rather are born of, this fact. All the doctrines must be interpreted by this doctrine. It is the measuring-rod of all Christian theology. And it is the justification of our belief in the Efficacy of Prayer. Christ has taught us, once for all, the logic of prayer. Here it is: "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in Heaven give good things to them that ask Him." It is a philosophy which we can all understand. Prayer is the heart of a child throbbing against the heart of a father. We can measure the instincts and laws of the divine Fatherhood by the instincts and laws of our human fatherhood.

Against all this there is only one argument—the reign of law, its universality and inflexibility. But this argument no more prevails against the efficacy of prayer than it prevails against the freedom of the will and our moral responsibility. Our will, moment by moment, utilizes the laws of nature. Shall not the Divine Will make the laws of nature its ministers? We cannot measure the possibilities that lie within the lines of God's laws. His great, pitiful Fatherhood throbs behind those laws, and somehow along their grooves He can send us the answer to our prayers. No need can come to us too small for His care, too great for His omnipotence. He is well pleased that we should lay hold of His divine arm with importunate cries. But our cries must be upborne and sanctified by that prayer of Christ in the shadows of Gethsemane, that prayer oftttimes wrung from such recoils of soul: "Thy will be done." This is the limitation of every prayer that is inspired by His spirit and winged with His name. We know not how God will accomplish His will, but we do know that our prayers lodge in His bosom, and, lodging there, become a force in the sum of things, and are blended with the forces that outflow from His bosom and make the conditions and events of our life.

WALTON W. BATTERSHALL.

ABOUT BOYS AND BOYS' CLUBS.

THE poor boys of large cities have three salient defects which render work among them highly perplexing and difficult.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are untruthfulness, irresponsibility (except in the "gang" relation), and inapplication.

Untruthfulness is quite as much a matter of ignorant habit as of perversity with them, and sensible exhortation may do something toward correcting it. Example will do more. If all philanthropic workers among boys should set the example of truthfulness, an appreciable improvement would result. It is no uncommon thing for these workers to vent threats they never intend to execute, and to make promises they never intend to keep. Nor is it rare for a man who drinks and smokes in his own *monde*, to simulate horror over smoking and drinking in this other *monde*. Now, it matters little to his street boys what his practices are in these respects, if only he avows them ; but it matters much to them what they are, when, by accident, they discover they are not what he tried to make them believe.

One way, a good way, and, perhaps, the only way to develop a proper feeling of responsibility, is to take the *esprit de corps* of the street gang, and gradually force it into a larger field of action. Properly handled, the "gang" conscience of the boy may become the civic conscience of the man.

As the absence of a feeling of responsibility eventuates in bad citizenship, so a lack of application results in shiftless dependence, if not in absolute pauperism. It is this lack of application that I wish especially to illustrate.

For several winters, seven or eight boys came to see me in my room, regularly, once a week. Though without club organization, they were pleased to call themselves a club. I had books, papers and games for them, and, at first, I let them do very much as they liked, just to see what they would do. They would not apply themselves to anything. They shifted rapidly from games to papers, papers to books and from books back to games. They even made demands, amounting to insolence, for new games, new papers and new books, before any real good had been obtained from those they had. The evenings thus spent were bad for the boys, bad for me, bad every way.

So I told the boys plainly that I could not afford to give them my time unless they would try to do something really worth while—something they could not do equally well by themselves. If they wanted to keep on coming, they must work with me a part, at least, of each evening. If they did not care to come to me with that understanding they were quite free to stay away. They were quick enough to see and admit the justice of what I said. They continued to come, and tried, in their own fitful way, to do their duty. At the end of several weeks, full of discouragements to both of us, they had learned to listen attentively to consecutive readings and talks. So much was encouraging. But, strangely enough, when they were allowed to take up the games at the close of the reading or talk they were unable to apply themselves thereto. A doubtful point, a bit of bad luck, a boast, a flash of envy, the sight of another game, a sudden whim, a nothing, was enough to break up a game. It was not until I had refused, night after night, to allow the beginning of a new game before an old game was finished, bearing down hard every time on the fact that such capricious conduct was absolutely unsportsmanlike, that I got the idea of honest sport into their heads. Finally, instead of playing different games by groups, we came to prefer sitting about a large table and playing the same game together. This game was chosen by vote. Everybody voted and everybody abided by the vote. Without realizing how much such a course meant, they were thus accepting to the full the consequence of their own act.

One night before this happy state of things was consummated, the club

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

united in demanding the use of a game I had not put into their hands because it was quite unsuited to them. I told them that the game was long, hard, and stupid, that they would be sorry if they took it; still, they might take it if they would play it through. The game was brought on. At the end of fifteen minutes, the boys were all wishing it well out of sight, but I relentlessly held them at it till the end—over an hour. It was a capital lesson. Not only did they never ask for that game again, but they did not ask for others without first inquiring how long they were and what they were like.

To bring a group of boys to apply themselves properly one evening a week to study and sport was no great achievement. Such occasional application is not a habit of application, and habit is the thing that counts in the long run. Still, it must have some influence in the development of character. That is why I have thought it worth speaking of.

"If you want to get up a boys' club," said a Boston philanthropist, not long ago, "all you need to do is to open the doors and let the boys boom in." I have had something to do with these "boom in" clubs, and they remind me more of herds of wild horses than of anything else in the world. It is of little account that boys are "kept off the street," if their doings within doors are worse than their doings without doors, and if the better boys are demoralized by closer association with evil than they have in the street.

The number of boys' clubs in Boston and vicinity is legion. And yet it is doubtful if more than half a dozen are successes in the sense of assisting real development of character, and this half dozen (almost without exception) have been made what they are by years of the thoughtful, earnest, tactful influence of the same men and women over the same boys. In our club, for instance, purposely kept small, boys have grown from boyhood to manhood (from twelve to twenty-one and even older) under such influence, with results that cannot be mistaken. In another, that has lately been allowed numerical expansion, there were several years of anxiety, study of boy nature and experiment, before large numbers were so much as considered. That they are now possible is due mainly to the splendid loyalty of the well-trained older boys.

The boys' club is not *per se* a good thing. It were even better, perhaps, to leave the boys to the natural impulses of their by no means altogether vicious street life than to coop them (bad and good together) within four walls, unless somehow—by force of rigid discipline, persuasion or affection, it matters not how—they are trained in the essential qualities of right living.

ALVAN F. SANBORN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED